2008

The effect of prisonization on female criminality

Anna Elizabeth Kosloski
Iowa State University

The effect of prisonization on female criminality

by

Anna Elizabeth Kosloski

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Major: Sociology

Program of Study Committee:
Matt DeLisi, Major Professor
Andy Hochstetler
Gloria Jones Johnson

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people to whom I owe gratitude for their support in my academic endeavors. First, I would like to extend a sincere thank you to my major professor Dr. Matt DeLisi for your constant encouragement. You continue to support my research and challenge me intellectually. Your mentorship has been essential to my success in the graduate program. Second, I want to thank Dr. Andy Hochstetler and Dr. Gloria Jones Johnson for kindly agreeing to be on my POS committee. Thank you for the time you invested in me and my research. Your feedback was vital to the completion and success of this project. Third, a special thank you to my sociology friends and colleagues: Molly Sween, Bridget Diamond Welch, Matt Parker, and Becky Sremack. Not only were you a constant source of encouragement, you made my graduate school experience all the more worthwhile. Finally, thank you to my family who has been by my side through it all. To my parents, who have made personal sacrifices to see me reach my dreams and who have always believed in me. I would not be where I am today without you and your unwavering support.

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Prisonization theory asserts that inmates who internalize the attitudes and behaviors of a criminal lifestyle are most likely to continue their criminal careers and thus less likely to desist from crime. Unfortunately, virtually all prior studies of prisonization have used male samples and ignored female inmates. Using official data from 174 female inmates in Arizona, the current study examined predictors of 10 forms of institutional misconduct. Net the effects of demographic, social history, criminal career, and other risk factors, women who had served prior prison terms were significantly likely to commit all forms of misconduct. The effect of prior prison experience was separate from other measures of criminal career/criminal propensity, which suggests that recurrently going to prison exerts a unique and powerful effect on inmate behavior. Implications for prisonization research are provided.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Since its conception the discipline of criminology has been devoted to theoretically understanding the causes of crime. This understanding has focused on male offending patterns. Throughout the history of the United States females have both committed and been punished for crimes, yet female offenders have been routinely excluded from the offending literature. This is in part due to the fact that females have traditionally commit crimes at a lower prevalence than males. It is also due to the fact that the work done within the discipline of criminology has traditionally been conducted by males on male offenders. Since the 1970s, as more women entered the discipline of criminology, research on female offenders, including theories on female offending, have grown. This is in part due to the development of feminist criminology. Over the past few decades feminist criminology has begun to point out the routine exclusion of women and girls from criminal research. It has also sought to incorporate the importance of gender in understanding the experiences and treatment of female offenders (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004).

In addition to including females in criminology research, feminist criminology has tried to counter arguments made in traditional criminological theories that are sexist. These theories typically attribute female criminality to sheer biological and psychological reasons for committing crime. For example, the heavily cited book, *The Female Offender* (1895) by César Lombroso and William Ferrero claimed females' inferiority to males. They argued females were more childlike and therefore less inclined to commit crime. Most biological theories of crime focus on female sexuality and hormonal differences when accounting for crime. It is here that feminist criminologists argue that sexist elements emerge and that

theorists neglect the importance of outside factors such as environmental influences (Blanchette, 2006; Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004; Regoli & Hewitt, 2006).

Sociological theories tackling criminality have also focused on male behavior. One sociological theory, strain theory, references the structural conditions and opportunities available to the individual. The author of strain theory, Robert Merton, argued that crime stems from an individuals inability to meet culturally approved goals, through socially acceptable means. According to Merton, these acceptable means can be blocked through institutions such as the economy, family, education and politics. Chesney-Lind and Shelden (2004) point out that Merton's theory, while compelling does not adequately explain crime and delinquency among female offenders. They argue that since females tend to have the same aspirations as males (i.e.: well paying job), yet lack the same opportunities because of discrimination, if Merton's theory was correct females should experience more strain and thus commit more crime than males (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004; Regoli & Hewitt, 2006).

Other prominent sociological theories of crime have been based solely on male populations. Sociological theories often examine male populations of crime in connection with social class. Criminologist Albert Cohen studied crime as a male, urban, lower-class phenomenon that in his eyes was a direct result of this populations' inability to conform to conventional middle class society. Social disorganization theory by Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay examined the spatial distribution of crime through an analysis of a sample of more than 60,000 male delinquents in Chicago. While this study yielded interesting findings about environment, cultural transmission, and crime it could not attest to female offending patterns. Travis Hirschi's, social bond theory was developed through a survey of four thousand high

school males where Hirschi willingly admits to excluding females from his analysis. All of these theories that are rooted deeply in criminological and sociological literature have routinely neglected to examine criminality of female offenders. Feminist criminologists argue that today there are no strong sociological theories to explain female criminality (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004; Regoli & Hewitt, 2006).

The examination of female offenders is increasingly important as recent literature and statistical data shows an influx of female offenders in the United States. More females are committing crimes and going to prison. Again, the corrections literature focuses on male offenders. Females are routinely excluded from studies that analyze misconduct and treatment while in prison. The prison experience is not universal, male and female offenders experience prison differently. A frequently cited theory when seeking to understand the experience of an inmate in prison is Donald Clemmer's prisonization theory. Prisonization theory holds that internalizing the attitudes and ideals of a culture are likely to persist in a lifetime of crime. The bulk of prisonization research has been conducted on samples of male offenders. Thus a majority of the corrections research is excluding female offending patterns while incarcerated. In order to understand and prevent criminal behavior, gendered theoretical perspectives need to be examined. Therefore this study seeks to address the female criminal experience through an examination of the current literature on female offenders and by addressing predictors of misconduct for incarcerated female offenders.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Female Misconduct

Criminology has traditionally been a discipline conducted by males about male offenders. Today in the United States, women comprise 51 percent of the population (U.S. Census, 2005). Thus, to exclude female offenders is to ignore more than half of the nation's population. In recent years studies on female offenders have emerged in the field of criminology. Feminist criminology has become a growing area in the field of criminal justice. Meda Chesney-Lind and Lisa Pasko (2004:3) argue that feminist criminology "demonstrates how gender matters, not only in terms of trajectory but in how the justice system responds to the offender under its authority." Today, feminist criminology is incorporating the importance of gender into the understanding and treatment of female offenders which has been routinely absent in prior literature.

Painting a Picture of Female Criminality

In 2006, the Bureau of Justice Statistics reported that females were being incarcerated at a growing rate. In fact, the number of females incarcerated in 2006 increased 4.5 percent since 2005 which was almost doubled the rate at which males were being incarcerated (2.7%). The most recent statistics estimate 112,498 women are currently incarcerated in prisons across the United States (See Table 1-1). While female offenders are not a homogenous group, characteristics of female offenders have frequently been cited. It is important to examine who these women are, the types of crimes they are committing and how the justice system is responding (Sabol et. al., 2006).

TABLE 1-1: PRISONERS UNDER STATE OR FEDERAL JURISDICTION, BY GENDER, 2000, 2005, AND 2006

Year	Total	Male	Female
2000	1,391,261	1,298,027	93,234
2005	1,527,929	1,420,303	107,626
2006	1,570,861	1,458,363	112,498
Percent change, 2005-2006	2.8	2.7	4.5

Source: Sabol, W. J., Couture, H., & Harrison, P. M. (2007). *Prisoners in 2006*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Crime in the United States has traditionally been marked as a male phenomenon. Males clearly commit a disproportionate amount of crime in the United States but crimes committed by females are on the rise. With a growing number of females committing crimes, stereotypes of female criminals have been depicted and special interest groups have examined commonalities among female offenders. These profiles are closely tied to race and class. In 1990, the American Correctional Association (henceforth ACA) published a profile of the adult female inmate in the United States. The ACA found that female prisoners tend to be women of color in their late twenties, who are single parents that have never married. With minor discrepancies further research illustrates truth to this profile (Fletcher, 1993).

Race

A controversial issue when discussing criminality is the rate of imprisonment for various social groups in the United States, particularly minority groups. The justice system has been charged as being sexist and racist based on the rates of incarceration for males and minorities. As Kathleen Daly and Michael Tonry (1997:202) point out in the 1990's "females made up 51 percent of the population yet represented only six-fourteen percent of those

prosecuted or confined in adult prisons." Additionally they recognize that the "12 percent of Americans who are black make up 40 to 54 percent of court and confinement populations." Based on National Crime Victimization Survey data, Daly and Tonry (1997) established a race-gender hierarchy for criminal arrests. They concluded the following from most likely to least likely to be arrested for a common crime is black males, white males, black females, and white females. They conclude that race and gender may be "embedded in criminal law" and the "decision-making process." Until this is addressed by policy makers the disparities will continue. Overall research on race and crime has produced mixed results, however, official arrest records indicate a disproportionate amount of minority involvement in crime, whether this is derived from actual criminal propensity or discretionary (Daly & Tonry, 1997; DeLisi, 2003).

Yet, while this overrepresentation of minority groups exists among incarcerated males there are documented changes among the demographics of incarcerated females. In 2006 the Bureau of Justice Statistics reported:

- The national incarceration rate was 501 per 100,000 U.S. residents.
- For males, the incarceration rate was 943 per 100,000 U.S. residents.
- For females, the incarceration rate was 68 per 100,000 U.S. residents.
- For white males, the incarceration rate was 487 per 100,000 U.S. residents.
- For white females, the incarceration rate was 48 per 100,000 U.S. residents.
- For African American males, the incarceration rate was 3,042 per 100,000 U.S. residents.
- For African American females, the incarceration rate was 148 per 100,000 U.S. residents.

- For Hispanic males, the incarceration rate was 1,261 per 100,000 U.S. residents.
- For Hispanic females, the incarceration rate was 81 per 100,000 U.S. residents.

According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2006) the rate of incarceration for White and Hispanic females is increasing while the rate of incarcerated African American females is decreasing. One interesting note is that Asian Americans and Native Americans are infrequently referenced in research on gender and crime. A challenge to the ACA's profile of the female offender is that in 2006 women ages 35 to 39 made up the largest percentage of incarcerated females. Table 1-2 shows the most recent available data on female offenders in prison broken down by age and race (Sabol et. al., 2006).

TABLE 1-2: ESTIMATED NUMBER OF SENTENCED FEMALE PRISONERS UNDER STATE OR FEDERAL JURISDICTION BY AGE AND RACE, YEAREND 2006

Age Group	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Total	103,100	49,100	28,600	17,500
18-19	1,000	400	300	200
20-24	11,500	5,400	2,900	2,400
25-29	16,100	7,500	4,300	3,300
30-34	17,200	8,200	4,700	3,000
35-39	19,300	9,100	5,500	3,200
40-44	17,900	8,700	5,200	2,500
45-54	16,200	7,700	4,700	2,300
55 or older	3,700	2,200	800	500

Source: Sabol, W. J., Couture, H., & Harrison, P. M. (2007). *Prisoners in 2006*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Socioeconomic Status

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (1999) reports that 56 percent of females held in State prisons and 73 percent of those held in Federal prisons have completed high school, while 34 percent have attended some college. Yet, the economic circumstances of these women are difficult as 37 percent of these women reported having incomes less than $600 per month

prior to their arrest. Furthermore, many of these women have minor children. As of 1999 the Bureau of Justice Statistics estimated that seven in ten women within the corrections system had children under the age of eighteen. With estimates placing these women as having an average of more than two children the Bureau of Justice Statistics estimates more than 1.3 million children with mothers under correctional supervision (Sabol et. al., 2006).

Health

Prisoners are a high risk group for a variety of health concerns. Overall offenders are more likely to have a history of alcoholism, substance abuse and engage in high-risk sexual practices. Female offenders are also likely to have a history of physical or sexual abuse. In 1999, the Bureau of Justice Statistics put out a report on female offenders. They concluded that 44 percent of women incarcerated said they were physically or sexually assaulted at some time during their lives. This high rate of abuse was echoed again in a Bureau of Justice Statistics *Profile of Jail Inmates* in 2002, where again 55 percent of female inmates surveyed reported a history of physical or sexual abuse prior to their current stint in jail. In fact, a substantial percentage of female prisoners report being abused in some point in their lifetime. One count estimates that four in every ten female prisoners have experienced physical or sexual abuse at some point in their life. Other studies have reported that female prisoners have experienced abuse at much higher rates than the general population, some citing this rate to be anywhere between six to ten times greater. The rate at which females with prior histories of victimization are committing crimes may need to be examined when deciding the treatment options for females behind bars (James, 2004; Pollock, 2002; Young, 2006).

Female prisoners typically have been noted as having drug abuse problems. The ACA found the average adult female prisoner to have started using drugs by the age of thirteen or fourteen. A study examining drug use and criminality discovered that female prisoners were heavier users of drugs than their male counterparts. Additional research found that about half of female prisoners had been using drugs or alcohol compared to only 32 percent of males at the time of their arrests. In 2002, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics' *Profile of Jail Inmates*, female prisoners were about 5 percent more likely to have a prior drug offense than male prisoners. Most literature on female offenders has shown that their onset of drug use begins very early. According to the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Colombia University, males and females use drugs for different reasons. Drug use was more common for girls that had been physically or sexually abused, but there was also an emotional component in their drug use. According a study by the Addiction Center, young girls were more likely to use drugs than boys when they felt hopeless or sad--drugs had become a form of self medication. Studies have found that drugs work as a gateway to other criminal activities as crimes become a means of supporting drug habits. Pollock discusses three major crimes females are heavily involved with do to drug connections: prostitution, selling narcotics, and larceny. These crimes will be further discussed when examining the traditional crimes women commit (Fletcher, 1993; James, 2004; Pollock, 2002; Young, 2006).

TABLE 1-3: CHARACTERISTICS OF ADULT WOMEN IN JAIL AND PRISON

Characteristics of Women	State Prison	Federal Prison
Race		
White	33%	29%
Black	48%	35%
Hispanic	15%	32%
Other	4%	4%
Age		
24 or younger	12%	9%
25-34	43%	35%
35-44	34%	32%
45-54	9%	18%
55 or older	2%	6%
Median Age	33 years	36 years
Marital Status		
Married	17%	29%
Widowed	6%	6%
Separated	10%	21%
Divorced	20%	10%
Never Married	47%	34%
Education		
8th grade or less	7%	8%
Some high school	37%	19%
High school graduate/GED	39%	44%
Some college or more	17%	29%

Source: Greenfeld, L. A.,& Snell, T. (1999). *Women Offenders*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Crimes Women Commit

Martha Stewart, a well known and successful American business woman, was sentenced to prison for obstruction of justice in 2004. Stewart served five months in the minimum-security in West Virginia. Stewart's stardom drove her further into the spotlight as

the allocations of insider trading and obstruction of justice unfolded. Stewart became one of the most well known female prisoners of the twenty-first century; however, her story is not the typical story of female prisoners in the United States. Female criminality is more dependent on victimization than male criminality. The offending careers of incarcerated female offenders shows a high prevalence of physical, emotional, and sexual abuse at the hands of those closest to them, particularly step fathers and intimate partners. This abuse sets into motion a complex set of problems including depression, low self-esteem, and drug and alcohol use. Over time drugs become the major focal point of female criminal offending and other crimes (e.g., theft and prostitution) are a means to obtain drugs. Female offenders do commit violent crimes but the violence is almost always in relation to and directed against abusive male partners; again pointing to the cycle of victimization. It is therefore imperative to not only understand the context and rate at which females are engaging in these specific types of crimes but consider this cycle of victimization when assessing the treatment options for female offenders (Shaw, 2003; Young, 1996).

Larceny Theft/Shoplifting

Criminal activity has been routinely designated as masculine and feminine. Certain crimes are associated as male or female offenses because of socially constructed gender dynamics in society. While larceny or theft is a crime that crosses all ages, ethnicities and sexes it is a crime statistically committed by more females. In 2002 the Bureau of Justice Statistics reported roughly 10 percent of females in prison for larceny charges while only 6.5 percent of males in prison were serving time for larceny. Larceny may be viewed as more “feminine” because many arrests for larceny are for shoplifting. Research indicates that there are even

gender differences in the ways in which males and females engage in shoplifting. Females tend to steal more items, steal from several stores, and steal items of lesser value. While males are considered to be "commercial shoplifters" and typically steal items that they can resell. Where as, females tend to steal items they need or feel they cannot afford males steal as part of a broader display of masculinity. Regardless of the gender differences larceny remains an offense females are committing. In 1998, there were 456,277 arrests made among females for larceny offenses. In 2002 the median prison sentence length for larceny charges was nine months. Reports show that stolen merchandise costs retailers billions of dollars annually (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004; Doris, 2004; Greenfeld & Snell, 1999).

Drug Crimes

As previously mentioned drug use is a major crime for female offenders. Drugs and alcohol are often used to deal with prior incidents of victimization and often become a gateway into other forms of crime. During the twentieth and twenty-first centuries drug use was a major proponent of women's entrance into the Unites States penal system. In 1998 there were more than a quarter million female drug arrests. Female offenders are more likely to be serving time for drug violations than males. This is in part due to the harsher sentencing of drug violations that grew out of the "War on Drugs" campaign. It can also be attributed to the rate at which females are using drugs which is increasing. In 2001, 7,430 (34 percent) females died from drug related deaths. In fact drug use by females has increased substantially over the years and is now one of the primary reasons why females are entering prison (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004; James, 2002; Young & Reviere, 2006).

Research on drug abuse has concentrated on males. Recent studies that have begun examining drug violations on females have noted differences between male and female patterns of drug use. Incarcerated female offenders are more likely to have used harder drugs such as cocaine or heroine before entering prison than male offenders. Studies have shown that females become engaged in harder drugs such as heroin and cocaine through intimate male partners who are also drug users. Additionally females that abuse drugs are much more likely to have a history of abuse than males. Drugs and alcohol become a coping mechanism for many users. Some studies suggest estimates as high as 70-80 percent of incarcerated female offenders with substance abuse problems have been victims of some form of abuse at some point in their lives. Sexual and physical abuse rates for females in the United States are high and females who are abused are often abused multiple times. According to research done by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, over half of the females incarcerated report physical or sexual abuse in their past. This abuse crosses all ages and ethnicities (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004; Henderson, 1998; James, 2002; Young & Reviere, 2006).

Through an analysis of ethnographic research Meda Chesney-Lind and Lisa Pasko (2004) were able to discuss the differences of drug use in multiethnic communities. Through an examination of Asian culture, which has stereotypically been deemed the "model minority" in the Unites States, Chesney-Lind and Pasko examined life histories to see how problems of illicit drugs existed in Asian American communities. What they found was that the family can act as a filter or facilitator of drug use. A total of 40 percent of their sample reported that their parents had problems with alcohol. Additionally, drug and alcohol use was routinely connected to physical or sexual violence. Through family problems such as parental drug use, violence, poverty, and living on the streets, these women found themselves turning

to drugs and alcohol. This reliance on drugs and alcohol is part of the cycle of victimization which often results in a variety of illegal activity. This example indicates that drug use among female offenders is often the result of larger social problems (Chesney-Lind & Pasko, 2004).

One thing is evident, female drug users are not profiting from being key leaders in the drug industry. Rather they are low-level users, who are often turning to drugs as a coping mechanism. Once they are caught because of harsher substance abuse enforcement they are spending time behind bars. Drug use among female offenders continues while incarcerated. Drug use behind bars has significant health consequences, with the high rates of AIDS/HIV in prison. Current research argues that substance abuse treatment options for incarcerated female offenders needs to be examined, as female offenders who participate in and complete treatment programs reduces recidivism. Many female inmates are not receiving substance abuse treatment and return to the community without any sort of treatment, which increases the likelihood of a relapse. With female offenders entering our prisons for drug offenses at a higher rate then ever before research on the drug use will need to be conducted at length (Young & Reviere, 2006).

Prostitution

Prostitution is defined as "the exchange of sexual access to one's body for something of value, most frequently money or drugs" (Monto, 2004:161). Prostitution is a crime dominated by females. Research indicates that many females become involved in prostitution prior to adulthood. Estimates by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare in 1978 reported 900,000 juvenile prostitutes in the United States, most of who were

females. Ronald Weitzer (2005) argues that research on prostitution has focused mostly on street prostitution; the lower strata of prostitution. Weitzer argues that the most prevalent type of prostitution is indoor work such as escorts, brothels and massage parlors, is often the most neglected by researchers. Weitzer says women working in indoor prostitution jobs, such as call girls can exercise more control over their working conditions. While there is a discrepancy in the types of prostitution, it is clear that this is a criminal act that cuts across all ages, ethnicities, and socioeconomic status. It also is divisive in that as Weitzer points out, street prostitutes are segregated by age, gender, race, appearance, income and locale. These demographics can influence a prostitute's daily experiences. Therefore more research is needed in understanding prostitution and criminality among female offenders (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004; Weitzer, 2005).

While prostitution is an area that is still relatively undeveloped current research does indicate a link between female offenders' drug use and prostitution. Sheila Maxwell and Christopher Maxwell (2000) have organized three frameworks for why prostitution occurs. The first is enslavement theory developed by Paul Goldstein in 1979. This theory is based around the tenant that prostitution is an economic means of drug addiction. Through a study Goldstein conducted on street prostitutes, he found that drug addiction preceded prostitution. His sample consisted of individuals in a lower socioeconomic class who had turned to prostitution to feed their drug habit. Enslavement theory implies that an individual will do anything for drugs, including engaging in sexual activities. A second theoretical framework among prostitution literature is that of structural-economic perspectives. These theories suggest that females become involved in prostitution as a means to financially support themselves. They argue that structural barriers (i.e.: discrimination) do not allow females to

earn substantial wages by keeping them occupied in unskilled, low-paying occupations. This entices females to seek illicit forms of income including prostitution. Finally, recent research sees prostitution and drug use as co-occurring behaviors. Citing Gottfedson's and Hirschi's (1990) *A General Theory of Crime,* Maxwell and Maxwell point out a common etiology of prostitution and drugs is that they are often part of larger criminal careers, as pathways to crime. This framework proposes that prostitution is not necessarily a choice rather is part of the larger deviant street scene (Maxwell & Maxwell, 2000).

Violent crime

Female offenders have traditionally been less violent than males. Based on the self reports of victims in 1998, females accounted for 14 percent of violent offenders. Data gathered by the Bureau of Justice Statistics *Special Report: Women Offenders*, found that:

- three out of four violent offenses committed by females was simple assault
- an estimated 28 percent of violent female offenders are juveniles
- three out of four violent female offender's victims were women
- Nearly 2 out of 3 victims had a prior relationship with the female offender
- An estimated four in ten females committing violence were perceived by the victim to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs at the time of the crime
- The rate at which females commit murder has been decreasing since 1980
- About 60 percent of female murderers are African American

According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics of the 60,000 murders committed by female offenders between 1976-1997 approximately 60 percent were against an intimate partner or

family member, while one in fourteen murders committed by females were against a stranger. This is not surprising because research shows that female offenders are likely to be victims of abuse prior to incarceration. Spousal homicide is one common forms of violent crime to which females are being locked up. A number of researchers have reported on issues for women in prison for killing abusive husbands or partners. Some research estimates that nearly 80 percent of female offenders in prison for killing their partners had been abused. While some of these cases result in acquittals based on "battered woman syndrome," or years of battering and abuse, but most result in years of imprisonment for charges of murder or manslaughter (Greenfeld & Snell, 1999; Mann, 1996; Pollock, 2002).

Coramae Richey Mann (1996) created a profile of the female killer based on secondary data analysis of criminal records of female offenders in six urban cities across the U.S. She found that not all female offenders who kill their partners or husbands fit the "battered woman syndrome." While many female offenders claimed self defense she found that there was not a strong history of violence against most of these offenders. While this is inconsistent with "battered woman's syndrome" where women typically face years of abuse it is important to acknowledge that domestic violence is frequently under reported and therefore might not be recorded. What this also indicates is that not all female offenders that commit serious violent crimes are doing so in self defense. Mann's profile of a female killer also went on to describe violent female offenders as generally minorities particularly African American and Latina, with a mean age of thirty-one, once married, and are mothers. This is fairly consistent with the ACA's profile of a female offender. Mann also found that 30 percent of these female offenders had previous arrest records for violent crimes such as assault. Mann found that most of the murders took place on the weekend in the home of the

victim and shared by the offender and both were under the influence of alcohol at the time of the attack. This profile illustrates a need for more research on serious violent female offenders as some of Mann's findings are inconsistent with research done by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. In 1999, Greenfeld and Snell reported that violent female offenders were more commonly described as white. Geographic location may have played a part in Mann's study finding a majority of violent offenders to be nonwhite (Greenfeld & Snell, 1999; Mann, 1996; Pollock, 2002).

Since the 1980's the rate at which females are committing murder has declined. Through an examination of the literature it is evident that a majority of violent female offenders are frequently victims themselves. Female criminality is a complex web of victimization that frequently includes an intricate set of problems including depression, low self-esteem, and drug and alcohol use. For female offenders, the earlier the onset of criminality the deeper these females get into a world of crime and one illegal activity unlocks the door to another illegal behavior. All current literature on female criminality, regardless of the criminal activity, calls for more research to be done on female offenders and for treatment policies to be created that are based on female patterns of offending rather than male patterns of offending.

Prison Misconduct

Penitentiaries, known today as prisons, were conceptualized out of the punishment doctrine which utilized confinement as a means of reprimand for crimes committed. In addition to punishing criminals, prisons serve to remove offenders from conventional society. Today there are more than 1,023 State and Federal prisons in the United States. According to the

most recent data put out by the U.S. Department of Justice Statistics there were 2,258,983 prisoners held in Federal or State prisons or in local jails in 2006, a 2.5% increase from the yearend in 2005. Kathryn Ann Farr (2000) notes that there has been a continuing drop in the national crime rate yet a steady increase in the incarceration rate within the United States. In 2006, 112,498 females were confined within the United States prison system. Since offenders are removed from society and confined in prison walls they live in relatively isolated society inmates develop their own social hierarchy, one that has been routinely documented as violent. This violence occurs in various forms of prison misconduct. Misconduct, generally is defined as failure to follow specific rules. In prison this can occur through acts of noncompliance such as disobeying staff and threatening staff. Misconduct can also include more criminal behaviors such as aggravated assault and arson. In criminology literature misconduct has traditionally been looked at as an expected adaptation to incarceration; as part of prison life. While most misconduct research has been consistently conducted on samples of male offenders females in prison engage in acts of misconduct as well. In order to manage behavior prisons have developed systems to classify prisoners at varying risk levels and deal with misconduct (Camp et. al, 2003; Craddock, 1996; Farr, 2000; Sabol et. al., 2006).

Inmate Classification

In order to manage prisoners behind bars correction agencies and individual states have utilized a classification system which ranks inmates on a risk scale for variables of prison misconduct. This classification impacts the security level of a prison to which the inmate shall be housed. The primary purpose of the classification system is “to keep custodial order

and prevent escape and thus risk to the community" (Farr, 2000:4). Basically, the classification system exists to protect other inmates and prison staff. Therefore Maghan (1999:5) explains that "dangerousness and escape proneness are the two most important factors in determining the type of prison and the level of security to which the offender will be assigned." Here, dangerousness refers to the "likelihood that an offender will constitute a risk to other prisoners and staff" (Maghan, 1999:5). The risk scale ranges from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high) and are created from information on an individual's life and criminal history. Classification decision is most commonly compiled and awarded by a panel of prison staff, psychologists and a security guard. Each state develops their classification system. For example, the Arizona Department of Corrections developed the Offender Classification System (henceforth OCS) which examines the following:

- Public Risk (i.e.: violence and escape)
- Institutional Risk (i.e.: assaultive, gang affiliation)
- Medical and Health Care
- Education
- Work Skills
- Substance abuse or sex offender treatment
- Proximity to Residence (i.e.: distance from homes and families)

These are then coded and scored with a numeric value. The most weight is given to Public Risk scores and Institutional Risk scores. These numeric values, 1 (lowest risk) to 5 (highest risk) are then matched to a grid that becomes a guideline for inmate corrections placement. What this means is that someone convicted of a nonviolent offense that has a history of violent or aggressive behavior may be placed in a higher security facility that someone who

committed a more serious offense but has no history of violence. According to Maghan (1999) the New York State Department of Correctional Services classified an inmate as high risk and placed them in maximum security if he or she fell into any of the following categories:

- Sophistication of crimes and criminal history
- Patterns of impulsive serious violence
- Pattern of serious callous violence
- Violence against authority
- Vicious serious violence
- Arson
- Sex crimes
- Group gang membership
- Nomad (history of moving between cities)
- Aggressive homosexual
- Suicidal
- Psychological instability

Consequently the classification system shapes inmates "overall correctional experience" impacting programs and privileges available to them (Farr, 2000:4). Prison classifications are fluid, they can change over time. If a prisoner has a violent encounter they may be reclassified as a higher risk level. Concurrently if a prisoner engages in an extended period of good behavior he or she may be reclassified downwards on the risk scale. The Arizona

Department of Corrections classifies misconduct into three categories. Group A violations include:

- Inciting or participating in a riot, disturbance, demonstration, or work stoppage
- Taking a hostage or kidnapping
- Intentionally causing the death or great bodily injury of another person
- Sexual assault
- Assault or battery with a deadly weapon or any assault on staff
- Escape, aiding escape, or preventing the discovery of an escape
- Arson
- Negligence or carelessness causing death or great bodily injury
- Possession or manufacture of dangerous contraband including weapons, explosives, escape paraphernalia, official documents, prison uniforms, or other items deemed a threat to institutional security
- Conspiracy to commit any Group A violation

These violations result in the possibility of detention for up to fifteen days, the possibility of mandatory placement in parole class for up to ninety days, loss of privileges, restitution, restriction, and reprimand. While Group B violations include twenty-seven less serious offenses such as:

- Fighting
- Gambling
- Tampering with security equipment

- Possession, manufacturing or consumption of any drug or intoxicant
- Engaging in sexual behavior
- Theft
- Profanity or obscene language and/or gestures

These violations are dealt with through a possible ten days in detention, a time loss recommendation, up to sixty days in a parole class, restitution, loss of privileges, restriction, and reprimand. Finally, Group C misconduct violations include acts of noncompliance including:

- Horseplay
- Unauthorized altering of physical appearance
- Bartering, selling, or trading goods with other inmates
- Failure to maintain personal hygiene
- Failure to maintain a clean living area

These are once again dealt with through restitution, loss of privileges, restriction, and reprimand (Arizona Department of Corrections; DeLisi, 2003; Farr, 2000; Maghan, 1999).

There are two limitations to classification and infraction records. The first is that prison classification is based on male offenders. As Emily Wright, Emily Salisbury and Patricia Van Voorhis (2007:311) note these "custody classification systems were developed male samples and were designed with male offenders in mind." A growing body of scholarship has called into question the validity of using this classification system, a system designed for male offenders, on female offenders. Farr (2000) concludes that female offenders pose less institutional risk for serious acts of misconduct such as riots, assaults, stabbings and deaths. She concludes a major problem with the classification system is over-

classification of women in regards to crime seriousness. Farr argues that since women who commit violent crimes are often victims of domestic violence by the individual they attack or kill and/or often accessories to a violent crime rather than the instigator low-risk female offenders are being classified as high-risk. She argues this can impact the treatment needs of incarcerated women. Harer and Langan (2001) disagree with Farr; through an examination of three large data sets of male and female offenders they concluded that the risk classification system is equally predictive of male and female violent misconduct. Therefore more research needs to be done to assess the incarceration classification and institutional adjustment on female offenders.

Second, prison administration has tremendous discretion over issuing misconduct violations. Not all inmates are treated equally. Craig Hemmens and James Marquart (2000) administered a survey to 775 male inmates in correction facilities in the state of Texas. What they found was that correction staff and inmate relations varied significantly based on age and race. They found that younger inmates tended to feel that prison staff was too forceful and treated them poorly. While African American offenders were more likely than White offenders to believe staff used too much force on inmates.

In a study by James Byrne and Don Hummer (2007:79) they found that prison violence is often under reported based on the definitions for what constitutes specific crimes. They use the example of homicide. They explain:

> *In 2000, there were 56 deaths classified as homicides in our federal (3), state (51) and private (2) prisons, along with 198 known suicides and 217 deaths from other means (e.g., drug overdose). We have know way of knowing how many of*

> *these 471 deaths were actually homicides, but it seems safe to assume that the 'official' number underreports homicide as a cause of death in prison.*

They continue by arguing that levels of assault victimization are at least ten times greater then the official estimates provided by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. They conclude that prison violence and disorder are underreported. In sum, classification systems are designed to aid prison administration in placing an offender in the appropriate security facility level. Yet current research questions the validity of a risk assessment model that is based on male patterns of offending. More research will need to be done to examine the inconsistencies that are occurring within the corrections classification literature.

Infractions

Criminologists have been examining prison misconduct for generations. With prison riots such as Attica in the 1970s and New Mexico in the 1980s prison administration are always looking for ways to contain behavior within the prison population. When examining misconduct recent studies have noted individual level demographic characteristics, inmate relationships and the correctional institutions themselves. Findings as to what has the most impact on prison misconduct are mixed.

In order to address the idea that prisons are incredibly violent places Nancy Wolff, Cynthia Blitz, Jing Shi, Jane Siegel and Ronet Bachman (2007) estimated the inmate-to-inmate and inmate-to-staff physical victimization levels in state prisons. Through surveys and interviews with 7,221 male and 564 female offenders on physical violence they concluded that the stereotypes alleging that prisons are violent places are in fact correct. The note that

little focus has been placed on examining victimization rates within prisons. They found the rates of physical assaults for male inmates to be over eighteen times higher than assault rates for males in the general population. The same was true for incarcerated females whose assault rates were twenty-seven times higher than females outside of prison. Over a six month period, 20 percent of inmates, both male and female, reported physical violence including: being hit, slapped, kicked, bit, choked, beat up, or hit and/or threatened with a weapon. Clearly, prisons are hot beds for physical violence (Wolff et. al. 2007).

To prison administration gang membership is a red flag for prison misconduct. Gerald Gaes and his colleagues (2002) conducted a multivariate analysis using misconduct data for 7,445 gang affiliated inmates in Federal Bureau of Prisons facilities. A negative binomial regression model was used to analyze variables on prison misconduct, demographics and gang variables. What they found was that specific gang affiliation was associated with an increase in violence for 20 out of 27 gangs in the Texas prison system. Additionally, they concluded that gang-affiliated inmates were more likely to be involved in drug and property violations. Gaes et. al. (2002) came to the conclusion that gang affiliation does matter even when accounting for individual characteristics. Not all research concurs. A recent study conducted by Matt DeLisi, Mark Berg and Andy Hochstetler (2004) concludes that chronic offenders or career criminal individual level characteristics are significant when examining misconduct. DeLisi et. al (2004) conducted a study of 831 males incarcerated in prisons in the southwest region of the United States significant findings emerged between previous gang involvement, prison gang involvement and violence in prison. The strongest predictors of prison violence were “career criminal variables” particularly violent histories, confinement histories and escape history (DeLisi et. al, 2004:377). Therefore they conclude that individual

level characteristics and pre-prison indicators of criminality impact behavior while incarcerated.

This individual, career criminal indicator is further supported by a study of inmates in Florida correctional facilities. Mark Cunningham and Jon Sorensen (2007) examined prison misconduct against demographic characteristics, offense, conviction and institutional characteristics for 24,517 male inmates. They found age to be the strongest predictor of violence. Concluding that inmates under the age of twenty-one were three and a half times more likely to commit violent rule infractions than those in the reference group (ages 31 to 35). They also found a positive relationship between sentence and violent misconduct, concluding that the longer the sentence an inmate was serving, the more likely he would engage in violent misconduct while in prison. The results of Cunningham's and Sorensen's (2007) study mirrors results of an earlier study conducted by Karen Casey-Acevedo and Tim Bakken (2001) that examined 123 female inmates in a maximum-security prison. They concluded that younger inmates serving long-term sentences were more violent than inmates serving short term sentences.

A second major theme that emerges in literature surrounding prison misconduct is the notion that infractions vary across institutional settings. That is they are the result of the institutional settings. The Wolff et. al (2007) study of physical victimization rates found variation among facilities as inmates housed in medium-sized and large prisons reported higher rates of physical violence than inmates in smaller facilities. As the prison population has gone up in recent years a notion that poor conditions including over crowding result in higher levels of inmate disorder. In a meta-analysis of prison crowding conducted by Travis

Franklin, Cortney Franklin, and Travis Pratt (2006) concluded that this was not the case. They concluded that the prison environment has little effect on misconduct.

In sum, misconduct is examined in criminology literature as how inmates adapt to incarceration. Misconduct of male prisoners has been studied at length through prisonization research. Therefore misconduct has been examined as the direct result of the prison environment and as related to individual career criminal characteristics. Ultimately, studying misconduct of criminal offenders, both male and female can potentially result in a means to better understand security assignment and treatment options available for prisoners.

Prisonization

The discipline of sociology has revealed the profound effect socialization, the way people develop and learn culture, can have on an individual's behavior. The importance of examining environments on human behavior holds true among inmates in America's prisons. Thus raising the question what effect does incarceration have on an individual's behavior? Criminologists have been examining criminal misconduct for generations. This research has culminated with numerous models for explaining inmate behavior. A central figure to this research was Donald Clemmer. In his landmark study *The Prison Community*, Donald Clemmer (1940) addressed what he saw as a form of assimilation in prison. He referred to this as prisonization. According to Clemmer, prisonization is "the taking on, in greater or lesser degree, of the folkways, mores, customs, and general culture of the penitentiary" (Clemmer, 1940:299). At the heart of Clemmer's theory is the notion that the prison code forces inmates to show loyalty to other inmates over prison staff. Clemmer believed that

virtually no inmate could remain entirely unprisonized and that sheer exposure to incarceration would indoctrinate an individual into aspects of the prison lifestyle.

Clemmer saw prisonization occurring within a series of steps. The first step dealt with the prisoner's status. Once in prison an inmate gives up their name for a number, they take on the dress of those surrounding them, and the individual vanquishes power to the warden securing their anonymity "in a subordinate group" (Clemmer, 1940:298). The second step of prisonization that Clemmer describes occurs as inmates' attitudes change. As inmates acknowledge their inferior role, they assign new meaning to behavior. Additionally, they learn new behaviors, such as gambling and sexual practices. While not every inmate will choose to participate in all the influences of prison culture, Clemmer argues, every inmate will be subjected to particular dogmas of the prison culture. Clemmer referred to these as universal factors of prisonization.

Clemmer (1940:94) acknowledged that prisonization could occur in varying degrees. He said:

"every man feels that influences of what we have called the universal factors, but not every man becomes prisonized in and by other phases of the culture. Whether or not complete prisonization takes place depends first on the man himself, that is, his susceptibility to a culture which depends, we think, primarily on the type of relationships he had before imprisonment, i.e. his personality."

In addition to individual characteristics, Clemmer argued that relationships an inmate has with someone outside confinement, such as family can influence the level of prisonization experienced. According to Clemmer, certain characteristics insulate prisoners from the negative effects of the prison environment. These include:

- The inmate is serving a short sentence
- The inmate has a stable personality characterized by a healthy upbringing
- The inmate maintains positive relationships with people outside prison walls
- The inmate refuses to integrate into a primary or semi-primary prison group (i.e. gang)
- The inmate abandons the mores of the prison community
- The inmate abstains from antisocial and deviant behavior while incarcerated

This can result in a lower degree of prisonization.

The reverse is true for those with higher levels of prisonization. According to Clemmer the following factors influenced higher degrees of prisonization:

- The inmate is serving a longer sentence
- The inmate has an unstable personality
- The inmate lacks positive relationships with people outside of prison
- The inmate who immersed their self in a primary prison group, such as a gang
- The inmate that grew more accepting of the prison dogmas or prison code
- The inmate is housed with a person(s) similar to themselves who embraces the prison code
- The inmate who is more apt to participate in deviant behaviors behind bars, such as gambling and sexual activity

The classification Clemmer developed acknowledges a spectrum of prisonization with two extremes. Clemmer's theory of prisonization, that incarcerated criminals are socialized into a prison culture, has since been examined in corrections research. This has been further

examined among theories of prison behavior, including the traditional prisonization models; the deprivation model and the importation model.

Deprivation Model

The deprivation model argues that inmates cope with imprisonment through a distinct prison subculture that exists within the structural confinements of prison. While Clemmer argued that prisonization can occur unconsciously through exposure to prison life, criminologists supporting the deprivation model argue this is a direct result of confinement conditions. In his landmark study *The Society of Captives*, Gresham Sykes (1958) built on Clemmer's prisonization theory with his concept of the pains of imprisonment. According to Sykes, prisoners face five types of deprivation. These include:

- Deprivation of liberty
- Deprivation of autonomy
- Deprivation of security
- Deprivation of goods and services
- Deprivation of heterosexual relationships

The *deprivation of liberty* exists as the primary world the prisoner knows becomes the prison and his or her prison cell. The prisoner is limited to movement that exists within the prison fence. Sykes (1958) acknowledges that through this mode of deprivation prisoners are at a double loss of liberty as they are confined to the institution and within the institution. Inmates are not allowed to travel, spend long periods of time outside participating in what we might describe as routine activities. Things such as bike rides, travel, etc. are unavailable to inmates as they live often very secluded lives while confined. Not only are inmates unable to move

freely outside of the prison walls but they are restrained within their movements in the prison as well. Prisoners remain in their cell until they are given permission by staff to spend time in another area within the prison, such as the yard. This can be rather unsettling for a prisoner, particularly if they valued their previous independence. Additionally they are told when to wake up each morning and when to go to sleep each night. They're schedules are set for them with strict rules and regulations as they are confined to and within the prison walls.

As prisoners are limited in setting their schedules they are limited in exercising autonomy or independence. They are not given the ability to make many choices in their daily lives rather rules are created specifically to limit their behavior. This is what Sykes refers to as the *deprivation of autonomy*. The inability to make decisions through heightened control of prison guards and staff may come as a relief to some inmates but Sykes argues most prisoners express hostility towards "their captors" as a result of this restriction. Sykes points out that much of the hostility comes from rules that simply "don't make sense" to the inmate population. In the New Jersey State Prison, where Sykes conducted his study, inmates we not allowed to take food from the messhall to their cells. While this may seem trivial to those of us on the outside of prison walls it is a direct representation of the lack of freedom in inmate has. For instance, consider meal time in America. For many American families dinner time is a family event. People spend a great deal of time planning meals, shopping for ingredients and preparing food. Busy American families set aside time that works with everyone's schedule to have a dinner together. These options do not exist in prison. Prisoners are told when to eat, where they are allowed to eat and what to eat by prison staff. This lack of control allows for resentment by the inmates. Something as simple as not being able to take food to their cell may seem unjust to an inmate. Whereas prison staff and guards may set

the rules to try and reduce conflicts that arise through the barter system, where inmates trade goods they acquired in prison. From Sykes standpoint loss of autonomy, or control over your life is painful. Sykes (1958:75) further argues:

" the prisoner's ability to make choices and frequent refusals to provide an explanation for the regulations and commands descending from the bureaucratic staff involve a profound threat to the prisoner's self image because they reduce the prisoner to the weak, helpless, dependent status of childhood."

This feeling of powerlessness will result in both the inmates' hostility towards prison staff and the need to question the validity of the rules.

The *deprivation of security* refers to a prisoner's constant need to watch his or her back. We house individuals in prison for committing crimes and separating them out from the rest of society. Yet, as Sykes (1958:77) explains there is something unsettling about forcing criminals to "associate with more than a thousand other criminals for years on end." Clearly some prisoners are more dangerous than other prisoners. When "Inmate A," is serving time for kidnapping is housed in a cell with "Inmate B" who committed two counts of first degree murder, there is quite a difference among the severity of the two inmates' crimes. This can result in inmates becoming suspicious of other inmates. According to Sykes (1958:77):

"While it is true that every prisoner does not live in the constant fear of being robbed or beaten, the constant companionship of thieves, rapists, murderer's, and aggressive homosexuals is far from reassuring."

Not only will an inmate live in fear of other inmates but Sykes argues there will come a time when each individual inmate will be "tested" that is that someone will try to push

them over the edge and the inmate must be prepared to defend themselves and/or their possessions. Failure of an inmate to defend his or her self will results in showing weakness and becoming a possible target for future abuse. Ultimately, Sykes argues that prisoners never feel safe while in prison among the company of other prisoners.

The *deprivation of goods and services* documents that because inmates are housed in total institutions, they cannot access the basic goods and services that exist in conventional society. Inmates are unable to travel, go to the grocery store, or go to their friend's house. Instead, the movements and day-to-day activities of prisoners are severely curtailed and completely controlled by prison guards and other correctional officials. Instead of going to the grocery store, they eat at specific times each day or eat in their cell (depending on their classification). Instead of associating with their friends, they are denied access to essentially anyone who is not a prisoner. Again, depending on their classification, prisoners might have little to no access to other human beings at all let alone family or friends. From Sykes perspective, to be deprived of goods and services is very painful.

Since inmates are housed with other inmates of the same sex, heterosexual individuals, with the rare exception of conjugal visits, are cut off from the ties of any sexual relationship with parties of the opposite sex. In most instances when a prisoner has a visitor the exchange between the two are separated by a glass pane. This is what Sykes refers to as the *deprivation of heterosexual relationships*. Sykes notes that this can be increasingly frustrating for inmates and that some will temporarily turn to homosexuality to deal with their sexual frustrations. Sykes argues that the bigger issue lies with the latent homosexual tendencies occurring with in the prison walls as it calls the individual's self conception, particularly their status, into question. Thus, the deprivation of heterosexual relationships,

Sykes argues, impacts an individual's psyche, particularly when it comes to how an individual defines his or her self and how others define the individual.

Imprisonment, as defined by Sykes is painful. It includes a loss of liberty, autonomy, isolation from the material comforts of our daily lives, a constant feeling of insecurity and for many prisoners a withdrawal from heterosexual relationships, all of which are a direct result of the structural features of confinement. It is through this loss of freedom or as Sykes argues "pains of imprisonment" that he sees inmates as more apt to misbehave while behind bars.

Since Clemmer's 1940 study and Sykes' 1958 study criminologists have furthered the deprivation model by looking at structural conditions within prisons. In 1961 Stanton Wheeler premised that time, specifically the length of confinement, would impact prisonization. While surveying 237 prisoners in a western U.S. penitentiary Stanton Wheeler (1961) expanded Clemmer's prisonization model and Sykes pains of imprisonment theory by arguing that prisonization occurs in what he refers to as a U-shaped distribution of conformity. What Wheeler found was that prisonization was heavily correlated with time; finding maximum levels of conformity to the prison code during the interim period of inmates' sentences. It was during the first and last six months of incarceration where adherence to the prison culture was minimal (Wheeler, 1961; Walters, 2003).

Michael Reisig and Yoon Ho Lee (2000) examined the deprivation model among 546 male and female inmates in the Republic of Korea. They examined antisocial inmate attitudes in response to prisonization. By utilizing the tenants of Clemmer's and Sykes' earlier works they developed hypotheses based on structural confinement, alienation, length of confinement and how far along in serving their sentence the inmate was in relation to their levels of prisonization. Through a series of one-way ANOVA models they found that

"prisonization was characterized by increasingly rigid environments" (Reisig & Lee, 2000:27). The study supported two primary hypotheses of the deprivation model, structural conditions and alienation's influence on the level of prisonization an inmate faces. There was not a significant correlation between time served and the level of prisonization. Ultimately, Reisig and Lee (2000) concluded the more rigid the prisons' structure the higher the level of prisonization inmates experienced. This study gives weight to the deprivation model across cultures, concluding that deprivation occurs in Korean correctional institutions as well as in the United States.

Just as Wheeler in 1961, recent research has noted the importance of time in shaping the attitudes and behavior of incarcerated individuals. Paul Stretsky and his colleagues (2007) notes that inmates who are immersed in the prison culture are likely to change their perceptions about gun carrying. Through semi-structured interviews with seventy-three male and female inmates in Colorado evidence was collected that showed a correlation between length of incarceration and support for gun possession. Stretsky et. al (2007) argue that this support emerges from increased exposure and internalization of the inmate code. This is made evident in the study through the frequent references to power and protection the inmates made. What is important to note in this study is that it does not support Wheeler's U-shape distribution as attitudes for possessing guns as a means of power grew stronger the longer the inmate had been incarcerated. What this study does show is assimilation into the prison culture. This prisonization was also found by Dennis Stevens in a 1998 study of female inmates in the American South.

In a study surveying 304 female prisoners, Dennis Stevens (1998), found time served in highly authoritarian prisons affected recidivism. Stevens (1998) argues the restrictive

model of the prison system stimulates a "culture of violence" within the prison. As Stevens found female prisoners with no history of violence prior to incarceration may commit violent crimes, once released as a response to prisonization. First, inmates' perceptions of the regimes of the prison in which they were incarcerated influenced their attitudes and priorities. For instance many women indicated family was their top priority prior to prison and independence became the number one priority for their life after incarceration. Additionally, women were surveyed about their future involvement with crime 81 percent of women reporting an anticipation of future violent crime believed they were incarcerated in a highly authoritarian regime, meaning they were heavily monitored and had a distant relationship with the prison staff. It is these coercive and controlling conditions that Stevens (1998) argues shapes recidivism. The longer the inmate serves in an authoritarian prison system, the more indoctrinated to the prison culture the inmate becomes.

Ultimately, the deprivation model argues inmate behavior is a direct result of the institutions that confine prisoners. The prison environment is controlling and oppressive. Instead of rehabilitating prisoners we are simply punishing them with rules and regulations, throwing them in with other prisoners and letting them fend for themselves. The result is frequently prisonization which emerges through a heightened awareness and acceptance of the prison code and a backlash against prison staff. Additionally, prisonization impacts future recidivism once the prisoners are released (Bottoms, 1999; Stevens, 1998).

Importation Model

In the 1950's the academic environment was heavily on the deprivation model, that structural conditions shaped behavior during confinement. During this time Clarence Schrag (1954:38)

argued “failure to investigate more thoroughly the dynamics of interaction among prison inmates may be a serious theoretical and methodological omission in criminological research.” By obtaining data on 143 inmates in a medium security building within a western state prison he was able to characterize inmate leaders. What he concluded was that inmate leaders tend to serve longer prison sentences, were incarcerated for more serious violent offenses and have a high rate of recidivism. Additionally inmate leaders are increasingly likely to be diagnosed as psychopathic. Schrag found this resulted in significantly more rule infractions for violations such as: fighting, attempted escape, and assault. What Schrag concluded was that “prison culture is organized around the values of its most persistent and least improvable members.” Thus Schrag was arguing that individual level characteristics of inmates confined to prison are significant in shaping prison culture. This sentiment was not taken lightly as researchers began examining individual level characteristics, which most significantly resulted in John Irwin and Donald Cressey’s importation model.

The importation model developed by John Irwin and Donald Cressey (1962) is an individual level analysis of the characteristics inmates develop prior to imprisonment. Importation argues that prisonization is the result of beliefs and behaviors outside prison that inmates bring with them while incarcerated. It is through these pre-penal convictions that subcultures among the prison population are created. The importation model suggests that not all inmates equally experience the pains and deprivation of imprisonment that Clemmer and Sykes were referring. Rather, it is individual values, beliefs and behaviors that some researchers argue shape prison misconduct during incarceration.

Irwin and Cressey (1962) argued that prisoners bring a distinct culture with them into prison and that conformity within prison is dependent on prior, external conditions. While

observing inmates in California corrections system, Irwin and Cressey categorized inmates into groups. These included the “thief subculture,” “convict subculture,” and the “legitimate subculture.”

According to Irwin and Cressey the thief subculture:

- Has high rates of recidivism (i.e.: arrested multiple times)
- Consists of members who are not seeking high status positions in prison
- Has individuals who seeks privileges that will make prison life easier (i.e.: coffee, photographs, a radio)
- Associates status with following the “right guy code” (i.e. not betraying each other to the police)

According to Irwin and Cressey the convict subculture:

- Is the most utilitarian and manipulative
- Has the highest recidivism rates
- Seeks privileges to enhance his or her position in the hierarchy
- Consists of members with traditionally long confinement histories
- Contains “hard core” members who seek status in the prison environment
- Is made up of inmates with stock maintaining the status quo

According to Irwin and Cressey the legitimate subculture:

- Includes a large portion of any prison population.
- Has the lowest rate of recidivism
- Is made up of prisoners who isolate themselves or isolated from the thief and convict subcultures

- Presents few problems to prison administrators
- Contains members who desire to achieve goals legitimated outside of prison
- Has members who are not seeking high status within the prison

As indicated by Irwin and Cressey (1962) the two deviant subcultures that exist within prisons, the thief and the convict, are not as clear cut as it may seem. The general prison population is influenced by both groups. Part of this difficulty in defining the groups comes from inmates who have served longer sentences who tend to blend between the two subcultures. Ultimately what this study theorized was that not all inmates ascribe to the same prison subculture. There are varying degrees of prisonization and these prison subcultures are largely created by the individuals' values and beliefs, which develop prior to incarceration. Thus the importation model suggests that inmates with more extensive arrest and incarceration histories, prior involvement with gangs, serious substance abuse problems, or previous use of violence should be the most difficult-to-manage offenders behind bars.

Since the 1960's years of research has been conducted that supports Irwin's and Cressey's importation model. Liqun Cao, Jihong Zhao, and Steve Van Dine (1997) utilized data from an intake study in the Ohio Penitentiary System that included data on 1,722 male and female prisoners and examined that data in relation to rule infractions while in prison. What they found was that the individual level characteristics such as age of admission into prison, education, gender, marriage, and race were significant in predicting rule infractions. What this reveals is that individual differences are more significant in shaping inmate behavior then structural conditions.

One subset of the criminal population that the importation model accurately describes is what Terry Moffitt coined as life-course persistent offenders. These are offenders who will

engage in criminality throughout their entire lives. These career criminals are often someone with distinct antisocial personality traits, someone with substance abuse problems and mental health issues. Current research reveals that Career criminals frequently are males with onsets of criminal behavior in early adolescence (DeLisi, 2005).

Literature on career criminals has considered incarceration as a period of criminal inactivity for career criminals. Matt DeLisi (2003:655) argues that among the "most active and dangerous criminal offenders, prison is not an exceptional event but instead a normal episodic occurrence during a lengthy offending career." Through an examination of 1,005 inmates from the southwestern United States, DeLisi concluded that prior criminality was a significant predictor of prison misconduct. Commonalities exist between career criminals and importation model literature. Both exert that individual level characteristics impact an individuals experience in prison. Importation and career criminal literature conclude that inmates are not a homogenous group. Rather a select group of prisoners based on individual characteristics will be more apt to engage in serious forms of misconduct while incarcerated, just as in conventional society.

Prisonization is the adoption of mores and customs of the prison community. Classic criminological theories of prisonization have split arguing that structural and environmental elements shape misconduct while other's have proposed that individual offenders bring elements of criminality with them to prison and these only magnify once incarcerated, resulting in misconduct behind bars. The classic prisonization theories were developed around male offenders. Recent literature on prisonization, if it includes female offenders, often discusses them in comparison to male offenders. Which is why, this study seeks to examine a strictly female sample to understand the prevalence of female misconduct,

particularly in relation to the roles of demographic and criminal history measures. The following research questions are examined: 1) Are demographic characteristics predictive of prison misconduct among female inmates? 2) Does criminal history positively predict prison misconduct among female offenders? 3) Do demographic characteristics offer more explanatory power than criminal history indicators in explaining prison misconduct of female offenders? 4) Does the deprivation model offer more explanatory power than the importation model when it comes to understanding prison misconduct of female offenders?

Hypotheses

The focus of the current study is to analyze prisonization theory on a sample of female offenders through an examination of predictors of ten forms of criminal misconduct. In doing so, this study will incorporate a series of measures into the analysis, including: demographic characteristics such as race and age; criminal history background measures (i.e.: confinement history and violence history); and sociological measures including education, work skill, and residence or family proximity. Listed below are the hypotheses that will be tested in the current investigation.

Demographics

H1: Race will be positively related to prison misconduct as non whites will commit more misconduct than whites.

H2: Age will be a predictor of prison misconduct. As age increases prison misconduct will increase.

Measures of Criminal History

H3: Severity or the seriousness of the offense resulting in incarceration will be positively related to prison misconduct as females with high risk scores will be more likely to engage in misconduct while in prison.

H4: Arrest history will be positively related to prison misconduct. Those offenders with more arrests will commit more misconduct while in prison.

H5: Female offenders with a higher risk rating for possession of a weapon will commit more misconduct while in prison than those offenders with low risk scores.

H6: The higher the risk rating for escape attempts the more likely an inmate will engage in misconduct.

H7: The more violent a history an offender has the more likely she will engage in misconduct offenses while incarcerated.

H8: The higher the prior incarceration rate of an offender the more likely they will be to engage in criminal misconduct while incarcerated.

H9: Association with a security threat group (i.e. gang) will be a positive predictor of misconduct.

Sociological Measures

H10: Education will be a negative predictor of prison misconduct.

H11: Work skill will be a negative predictor of prison misconduct.

H12: The closer an individual's family members are the more likely they will be to desist from misconduct. Therefore residence is a negative indicator of prison misconduct.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

The data from this study come from official correctional records of female inmates serving time in the Arizona Department of Corrections and were collected between January and March 2001. This original data were collected by Dr. Matt DeLisi at Iowa State University. The data set was then modified to strictly examine trends in female criminal offending and confinement.

Data and Sample

Data were derived from publicly available information recorded by the offender classification system within the department of corrections of a large state located in the southwestern United States. The purpose of the offender classification system is to provide an appropriate classification and institutional placement to each inmate who is committed to correctional supervision by the criminal courts. To accomplish this, an objective administrative classification system quantifies each inmate's risk assessment according to his or her social background, criminal history, substance abuse history, and related demographic information. Each area is scored as follows: 1 (Very low risk), 2 (Low risk), 3 (Moderate risk), 4 (High risk), and 5 (Very high risk).

A simple-random sample from a roster of over 20,000 inmates yielded an initial sample of 1,005 inmates. Of the inmates selected, 831 were male (83 percent) and 174 were female (17 percent). The demographic estimates did not appreciably differ from the prison population parameters: 92 percent male, 8 percent female; 45 percent White, 24 percent Hispanic, 15 percent Black, 5 percent Native American, and 1% Asian American (DeLisi 2003).

The purpose of this study is to examine female criminality, thus the females became the sample for this study, making the final analytical sample n=174. The demographics of female criminal offenders are similar to the overall prison population by race, age and sentence length. The total female prison sample was 42.5 percent (n=74) White, 36.2 percent (n=63) were Hispanic, 11.5 percent (n=20) were Black, 9.2 percent (n=16) were Native American, and 0.6 percent (n=1) were Asian American. The ages of the inmates ranged from 17 to 61 with a mean of 30. The inmates' sentence lengths were coded and ranged from less than one year to life in prison with an average sentence length of 20 years (see Table 3-1).

Independent Variables

Prior corrections literature illustrates that age, race and sex have been significant factors in prison misconduct. Traditionally males from minority groups have been over represented among the prison population. Additionally research has found that African Americans are more likely to be cited for infractions while in prison than white inmates (Poole & Regoli, 1980; Daly & Tonry, 1997). While running the models, race was dummy coded to test if race was predictive of misconduct. In keeping with the profile of a female offender codes were operationalized as 0= White, 1 = Nonwhite. Based on the literature it was hypothesized that nonwhites would have higher infractions for prison misconduct than whites.

Age has also been a strong predictor of misconduct while incarcerated. Recent studies have shown that the younger the offender the more prone they are to engaging in misconduct than older inmates (Cunningham & Sorensen, 2007; Casey-Acevedo & Bakken, 2001). Here age is recorded as the individual's precise age at the time of their offense. It was continuously coded from 17 to 61 years (mean = 30.24, SD = 9.20).

Seven criminal history variables were also examined. In keeping with offender literature, recidivism is high among inmates who have experienced prisonization. Therefore prior incarceration is an important variable to examine. Additionally risk level criminal history variables were examined, including: severity or seriousness of the offense they committed in relation to their incarceration; arrest history; past history of possession of a weapon; past attempts at escaping prison; the offender's violence history, and affiliation with a gang. Each variable was coded in the offender's criminal record based on a risk scale from 1 (very low risk) to 5 (very high risk).

Additional sociological variables were taken into consideration, including: education, work skill and residence. Less research has been done on the impact of these variables and misconduct and the findings are mixed (Gendreau et.al, 1997; DeLisi & Munoz, 2003). For education the interval risk scale is reverse-coded and high risk indicates low educational attainment. Four percent (n=7) were scored as low educational attainment. Eight percent (n=14) were listed as high educational attainment while 88 percent (n=153) fell somewhere in between or were not scored. The same can be said for work skill which was scored as one inmate was scored as having a high work skill set (0.6 percent) while thirty-one inmates had little to no work skills (17.8 percent) and the rest of the one hundred and forty-two inmates fell somewhere in between or were not scored on the interval scale (81.6%). Residence was the proximity an inmate's family was in relation to the prison. This was hypothesized to have a negative impact on prison misconduct based on prisonization theory in which Clemmer (1940) argued that positive relationships outside of prison can deter prisonization. Residence was scored in an interval scale based on the proximity of family members 1(very low risk) for family members in close proximity and 5 (very high risk) no family members close.

Table 3-1. Offender Demographics Table (N = 174)

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Age Now	30.24	9.19	17	61
Sentence Length	20.77	130.02	0.25	999

Dependent Variables

Prison misconduct exists on a spectrum of offense seriousness, from discretionary infractions to criminal infractions. In this study, data was obtained on infractions from 174 female inmates in the Arizona Department of Corrections. The data from these records are count data and measure the number of times these infractions occurred for each inmate. The data was compiled and ten forms of prison misconduct were found amongst the records of the 174 female offenders (see Table 3-2). These ten were then subdivided into two general types of violations. On one hand are technical violations of prison rules and policies which reflect general noncompliance with prison procedures. These types of offenses are highly discretionary in that correctional officials have wide latitude or discretion to decide whether to issue a violation for breaking prison rules. These violations tend to be less serious in nature and reflect relations between inmates and staff. Examples include:

- Obstructing staff which prohibits a staff member from being able to do their job (Mean= .3276, SD = 1.20)
- Refusing staff or not listening to staff orders (Mean=.2184, SD = .818)
- Threatening others, this could be staff or other inmates (Mean= .1264,

SD = .522)

- Being in an unauthorized area as inmates security levels restrict their freedom to move about (Mean=.7586, SD =3.08)
- Lying or being caught being deceitful by or to the prison staff (Mean= .0402, SD = .271)

On the other hand, other forms of prison misconduct are in fact violations of criminal law and are the type of behaviors that offenders would be arrested for in conventional society. Like crimes, criminal violations encompass violent offending, property offending, drug offending, and public-order offending. Examples are:

- Aggravated assault which is an assault that results in great bodily injury (Mean= .0977, SD= .452)
- Fighting or simple assault (Mean= .2126, SD= .604)
- Possession of drugs, such as cocaine, heroin, marijuana, etc. (Mean= .2471, SD= .8813)
- Possession of a weapon (Mean= .1150, SD= .567)
- Engaging in sexual behavior with inmates (Mean= .1839, SD= 1.15)

Each variable was coded in the offender's criminal record based on a risk scale from 1 (very low risk) to 5 (very high risk).

Table 3-2. Female Prisoner Misconduct (N = 174)

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Rioting	0	0	0	0
Hostage	0	0	0	0
Kill in prison	0	0	0	0
Rape in prison	0	0	0	0
Agg in prison	0.10	0.45	0	4
Escape from prison	0.02	0.23	0	3
Arson in prison	0.02	0.13	0	1
Weapons possession	0.11	0.57	0	5
Threaten staff	0.12	0.52	0	4
Fighting	0.21	0.60	0	4
Extortion	0.02	0.13	0	1
Lying	0.27	1.07	0	10
Tampering	0.04	0.27	0	3
Drugs in prison	0.25	0.88	0	6
Disobey staff	2.24	4.95	0	25
Obstruct staff	0.33	1.20	0	9
Sex acts	0.18	1.15	0	10
Unauthorized area	0.76	3.08	0	26
Refusal of order	0.22	0.82	0	5

Since the Arizona Department of Corrections publishes correctional records online I was able to obtain the individual correction records of each of the 174 female inmates in this sample. The data was initially connected with no personal identifiers, leaving only offender demographic and relevant criminal history for me to examine. Using this data I developed vignettes of a sample of the inmates, to further aid in the discussion of the analysis. Each inmate was given a pseudonym and discussed in relation to the misconduct violations examined in this study.

Statistical Analysis

Criminal records are a combination of event count data and interval scales that measure institutional risk. Event counts are the number of observed actions that take place within a specific point in time. Event count data faces challenges for statistical analysis because counts are bound by zero, do not occur independently, are positively skewed and take only integer values; all conditions which cannot be met through ordinary least squares (OLS) regression. Researchers generally account for this by using the Poisson distribution. The Poisson distribution is as follows:

$$p(x; \lambda) = \frac{\lambda^x e^{-\lambda}}{x!} \quad \text{for } x = 0, 1, 2,\ldots$$

Since event counts are bound by zero their variance increases with the expected value. For a Poisson, the mean (λ) and the variance (σ^2) should be relatively equal but when the variance exceeds the mean ($\lambda < \sigma^2$) counts become overdispersed. Therefore the Poisson model works best for low count events. Where as high count event data, such as criminal arrest records or infractions, which will result in overdispersion using the Poisson distribution can best be assessed through negative binomial regression models. To account for unobserved heterogeneity, the negative binomial model calculates a dispersion parameter (α) that acts to increase the conditional variance of *y*. This allows for the negative binomial model to generate fewer false positives than any other model. The negative binomial regression model equation is:

$$\Pr(Y_i = k|\chi_i) = \Gamma(k + \alpha^{-1})/k!\Gamma(\alpha^{-1})(\alpha^{-1}/\alpha^{-1}+\mu_i)^{a-1}(\mu_i/\alpha^{-1}+\mu_i)^k \quad k= 0,1,2\ldots$$

Therefore, negative binomial regression models can account for complexity with count data including zero counts, high frequencies, and overdispersion (Zorn, 1998).

CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS

While female offenders have been neglected from corrections research the current results show that female offenders are involved in antisocial behavior while under the supervision of correctional authorities. Through an analysis of misconduct violations including discretionary, noncompliance violations including: obstructing staff, refusing staff, threatening others, being in an unauthorized area, and lying and more severe criminal misconduct violations that include: aggravated assault, fighting, possession of drugs, possession of a weapon, and engaging in sexual behavior with other inmates the effects of prisonization on female offenders are assessed.

TABLE 4-1: NEGATIVE BINOMIAL REGRESSION MODEL FOR OBSTRUCTING STAFF (N=174)

LRchi2(9) = 34.04
Prob > chi2 = 0.0002
Pseudo R2 = 0.1838

	B	SE	z-score
Race	1.59*	0.33	1.87
Age	0.01	0.35	0.33
Severity	-0.97*	0.45	0.03
Arrest History	0.58	0.65	-2.13
Weapon History	0.57	0.64	0.88
Escape History	-0.66	0.67	-0.98
Violence History	-0.66	0.63	-1.05
Confinement History	1.61**	0.44	3.70
Security Threat Group	5.68	3.63	1.57
Education	0.55	0.65	0.84
Work Skill	0.62	0.40	1.54
Residence	-3.28 *	1.31	-2.50

* p< 0.05 ** p < 0.01

Obstructing staff is an example of a discretionary form of misconduct in which inmates are cited for impeding correctional officers or other staff from doing their job. As shown in Table 4-1, two significant predictors of obstructing staff emerged from the model. Race was significant as non-white women accumulated more infractions for obstructing staff than white women (b = 1.59, z = 1.87). Most importantly, confinement history exerted a positive and strong effect on obstructing staff (b = 1.61, z = 3.70). Consistent with prisonization theory, women with lengthy prison records were significantly likely to be cited for obstructing staff. With corrections records we can only speculate as to why this is but it is possible female offenders that have been in and out of the prison system feel more confident defying staff. It is possible that these offenders know the consequences of the actions and see them as minimal. Additionally it was hypothesized that residence (b = -3.28, z = -2.50), or the proximity of family members to the offender would reduce misconduct. Here, we see that misconduct is reduced when the offender has family members in close proximity. It is possible that an offender does not want to jeopardize any visitation rights and desists from this form of misconduct. This parallels Clemmer's theory that individuals will experience lower degrees of prisonization when they have positive relationships outside of prison.

One variable were related to obstructing staff in an unexpected direction. Offense severity was negatively predictive of obstructing staff (b = -0.97, z = 0.03) as women convicted of more serious felonies were less likely to get cited for this offense. It is possible these women with more serious offenses are entering prison and are more careful about getting into trouble. It is possible these female offenders are committing crimes against abusers and therefore even though they committed a very violent offense(s) they may not be a further threat for misconduct violations.

TABLE 4-2: NEGATIVE BINOMIAL REGRESSION MODEL FOR REFUSAL (N=174)

LRchi2(9) = 59.17
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Pseudo R2 = 0.3454

	B	SE	z-score
Race	-0.17	0.26	-0.66
Age	0.23	0.02	0.99
Severity	-0.44	0.43	-1.03
Arrest History	0.56	0.48	1.16
Weapon History	0.80	0.54	1.46
Escape History	0.81*	0.42	1.95
Violence History	-3.53**	1.18	-3.00
Confinement History	2.10**	0.39	5.44
Security Threat Group	-1.01	1.23	-0.83
Education	0.67	0.43	1.57
Work Skill	0.59	0.33	1.81
Residence	0.29	1.04	0.28

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

Refusing to listen to or behave in accordance with prison staff is a noncompliance discretionary form of misconduct. Two variables were positively associated with refusing staff. These included confinement history (b=2.10, z = 5.44) and escape history (b=0.81, z= 1.95). As predicted by prisonization theory, a female offender's history of incarceration and risk of escape significantly predicted obstruction of staff while incarcerated. This may be due to their general comfort and understanding of the prison system. They might feel that refusing a staff's orders does not hold a very high punishment. In some cases not listening to staff may come with a minimum punishment but the image that comes with refusing to listen to a staff member may out weight the consequences. Surprisingly a history of violence was

negatively associated with obstructing staff (b= -3.53, -3.00). It was hypothesized that those in prison with a strong history of violence would be more apt to refuse staff orders but this was not the case. This may be due to the fact these individuals are watched more closely by prison guards.

This is illustrated by one Arizona inmate, Doris (pseudonym). Doris is 61 years old and is serving an 18 year prison sentence in an Arizona state facility for kidnapping. Doris has a colorful criminal background. She has a very high (5) risk assessment of escape and is considered a moderate threat for weapons violations. Doris has threatened staff on two specific instances. She has twenty disobeying staff violations and has been found to have a weapon in her possession on five separate occasions. From prisonization research we can see Doris has adopted the "prison code," meaning her actions are epitomizing the notion of prison life.

TABLE 4-3: NEGATIVE BINOMIAL REGRESSION MODEL FOR LYING (N=174)

LRchi2(9) = 45.26
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Pseudo R2 = 0.2477

	B	SE	z-score
Race	-0.49	0.31	-1.59
Age	-0.00	0.35	-0.03
Severity	-0.86*	0.43	-1.99
Arrest History	0.40	0.52	0.76
Weapon History	0.84	0.55	1.54
Escape History	-1.10*	0.54	-1.99
Violence History	-0.19	0.50	-0.38
Confinement History	1.26**	0.37	3.42
Security Threat Group	6.72	2.71	2.48
Education	-0.24	0.51	-0.46
Work Skill	1.30**	0.41	3.06
Residence	-3.80**	1.10	-3.21

* p< 0.05 ** p < 0.01

Lying is a minor misconduct offense which inmates are cited for when they are dishonest to the prison staff. Lying was found to be significantly correlated with confinement history (b = 1.26, z = 3.42). Therefore offenders who had served more time behind bars were more apt to lie to prison staff. Surprisingly, inmates with higher work skills (b= 1.30, z = 3.06) were significantly more likely to lie to prison staff. These inmates may have more opportunities to lie to staff because when inmates have work skills they are often given jobs within the prison. Therefore they move about the prison more, interact with more individuals and have more opportunities and possibly reasons to lie. Residence (b= -3.80, z = -3.21)was also associated with lying. As predicted the closer an inmate's family was to the prison the less likely they

were written up for lying. Again, according to prisonization theory inmates with pro-social relationships are less likely to engage in the prison culture.

Contradictory to what was predicted utilizing prisonization theory, two variables were negatively associated with lying to staff. These included: severity (b= -0.86, z = -1.99) and escape history (b = -1.10, z = -1.99). This implies that it is not the seriousness of the crime committed or the risk assessment of an individual for escape but rather their past criminal record and mobility around the prison that influence whether or not they will be more likely to lie to prison staff.

TABLE 4-4: NEGATIVE BINOMIAL REGRESSION MODEL FOR THREATENING OTHERS (N=174)

LRchi2(9) = 44.72
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Pseudo R2 = 0.3651

	B	SE	z-score
Race	-0.44	0.32	-0.97
Age	0.04	0.04	1.21
Severity	-2.48**	0.62	-4.03
Arrest History	0.05	0.75	0.07
Weapon History	2.12*	0.86	2.45
Escape History	0.07	0.61	0.12
Violence History	-0.49	0.72	-0.70
Confinement History	1.41**	0.42	3.34
Security Threat Group	2.51	2.98	0.84
Education	0.67	0.67	1.01
Work Skill	1.22*	0.54	2.24
Residence	-3.25**	1.03	-3.15

* p< 0.05 ** p < 0.01

Threatening others is a discretionary variable that includes threats to both staff and other inmates. Three measures that are positively correlated with threatening infractions these

include most significantly weapons history (b= 2.12, z = 2.45), confinement history (b = 1.41, z = 3.34), work skill (b = 1.22, z = 2.24) and residence (b = -3.35, z = -3.15). Work skill was unexpectedly correlated with threatening others. It was hypothesized that the higher the work skill the less likely the offender would threaten someone else. This was not the case, we can speculate that having more job skills allows individuals more opportunities around the prison. They would come in contact with more people, and therefore they may have more reasons and opportunities to threaten others. They may also acquire more things to trade in the barter system where threats could be frequently used. Unexpectedly one variable was negatively associated with threatening staff. This was offense severity (b = -2.48, z = -4.03). This may be connected to the classification of female offenders. Those committing serious offenses before entering prison may not be a threat once they are in prison.

An example of these findings is best illustrated through Tammy, a twenty-nine year old woman serving ten years in an Arizona prison. She is a low risk for both gang involvement and substance abuse. Yet, she has one count of criminal misconduct for arson and one for fighting. She is high risk for weapons violations. Tammy has a history of confrontations with prison staff as she has acquired twenty-three infractions for disobeying prison staff, eight counts of disrespecting staff, and four counts of threatening staff.

TABLE 4-5: NEGATIVE BINOMIAL REGRESSION MODEL FOR BEING IN AN UNAUTHORIZED AREA (N=174)

LRchi2(9) = 53.66
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Pseudo R2 = 0.1695

	B	SE	z-score
Race	-0.11	0.24	-0.46
Age	0.05*	0.02	2.18
Severity	-0.55	0.35	-1.58
Arrest History	0.72*	0.35	2.07
Weapon History	-0.02	0.39	-0.04
Escape History	-0.30	0.47	-0.64
Violence History	-0.18	0.43	-0.42
Confinement History	1.54**	0.32	4.89
Security Threat Group	-1.53	1.02	-1.50
Education	1.14*	0.45	2.55
Work Skill	0.56	0.32	1.74
Residence	-1.21	0.70	-1.71

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

Being in an unauthorized area is the final discretionary form of misconduct that was examined. Here, inmates are issues infractions when they are found in a restricted area. As shown in Table 4-5, four significant predictors of being in an unauthorized area emerged in the model, two sociological variables and two criminal history variables. The sociological variables that predicted being in a restricted area included age (b = 0.05, z = 2.18) and education (b = 1.14, z = 2.55). Criminal history variables included arrest history (b = 0.72, z = 2.07) and confinement history (b = 1.54, z = 4.89). This is consistent with prisonization theory that asserts female offenders with a higher history of criminal records will be significantly more likely to be in an unauthorized area. Education was correlated in an unexpected direction as it was hypothesized that the more education an inmate had the less

likely they would engage in misconduct. This was not the case. We can speculate that these inmates may enter the social hierarchy of the prison and gain a superior status, therefore to maintain their identity they engage in more misconduct violations. More than likely, these individuals are perceived by prison guards as more knowledgeable or more trusting. They may have more access to prison facilities and may be monitored less than other inmates and therefore they may have more opportunities to roam about the prison and enter restricted areas.

TABLE 4-6: NEGATIVE BINOMIAL REGRESSION MODEL FOR AGGRAVATED ASSAULT (N=174)

LRchi2(9) = 31.29
Prob > chi2 = 0.0018
Pseudo R2 = 0.3015

	B	SE	z-score
Race	1.73*	0.32	2.25
Age	0.00	0.04	0.01
Severity	-1.71**	0.54	-3.17
Arrest History	0.90	0.69	1.29
Weapon History	0.68	0.85	0.80
Escape History	-0.74	0.81	-0.92
Violence History	-1.67	1.04	-1.61
Confinement History	1.44**	0.49	2.95
Security Threat Group	9.20*	4.23	2.17
Education	1.74	0.73	2.39
Work Skill	-0.08	0.44	-0.19
Residence	-4.34**	1.45	-2.99

* p< 0.05 ** p < 0.01

Aggravated assault is a criminal violation that results in great bodily injury. This is a serious criminal violation both in and out of prison. Surprisingly, severity of crimes committed were

negatively predictive of aggravated assault (b = -1.71, z = -3.17). Residence, or proximity to family members, as expected was negatively correlated to aggravated assault infractions (b = -4.34, z = -2.99). Therefore the closer an inmate's family was to prison the less likely they were engaging in aggravated assault. This is consistent with prisonization theory. As shown in Table 4-6, aggravated assault was strongly correlated with three variables. Two of these measures were criminal history variables while the other was a sociological variable. Criminal history variables included confinement history or previous incarceration (b = 1.44, z = 2.95) and security threat group or gang affiliation (b = 9.20, z = 2.17). These were both found to be strong predictors of aggravated assault. This is not surprising as gang members are frequently fighting other prison gangs. This is the part of the prison code. Additionally, race (b = 1.73, z = 2.25) exerted a positive effect on aggravated assault citations as nonwhites accumulated more infractions for aggravated assault. Therefore previous incarceration reflects a higher propensity of aggravated assault citations, which is consistent with prisonization theory.

TABLE 4-7: NEGATIVE BINOMIAL REGRESSION MODEL FOR POSSESSION OF A WEAPON (N=174)

LRchi2(9) = 46.45
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Pseudo R2 = 0.4441

	B	SE	z-score
Race	-0.21	0.55	-0.37
Age	0.02	0.04	0.45
Severity	-2.34*	0.92	-2.58
Arrest History	1.63	1.38	1.18
Weapon History	1.57	1.41	1.11
Escape History	-1.70	1.03	-1.65
Violence History	-6.90*	2.93	-2.35
Confinement History	4.10**	1.45	2.83
Security Threat Group	12.57*	5.71	2.20
Education	3.47**	0.75	2.61
Work Skill	-0.61	2.07	-0.82
Residence	-3.25	10.39	-1.56

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

Possession of a weapon was found to be highly correlated with three variables including: confinement history (b = 4.10, z = 2.83), security threat group (b= 12.57, z = 2.20), and surprisingly education (b = 3.47, z = 2.61). Concurrent with prisonization theory length of time incarcerated and affiliation with inmates that have internalized the prison subculture through gang affiliation are strong predictors of an inmate carrying a weapon. However, the education correlation was unexpected. Highly educated individuals may be more apt to carry a weapon because they may have not have a history of violence or arrests and therefore may feel more secure with a weapon. It is also possible that these individuals are trusted more by prison guards, or thought to know better and therefore they many have jobs or more freedom

among the prisoners and can easily access materials to make weapons. Unexpectedly two criminal history variables were negatively correlated with possession of a weapon. These included severity (b = -2.34, z = -2.58) and violence history (b = -6.90, z = -2.35). It is possible that individuals with a history of violence may feel that prison staff members are watching them more closely and therefore they may not feel comfortable carrying weapons.

This is more clearly illustrated in the case of an Arizona Corrections inmate named Jackie. Jackie is a 40 year old incarcerated female prisoner. She is serving a 7 year sentence for child abuse. Jackie has sixteen counts of disobeying prison staff, five counts of disrespecting staff, and one count of threatening staff. On two occasions Jackie has been found in possession of a weapon. She has also been caught with contraband on two occasions and is considered at high risk of substance abuse. She has a moderate risk rating for gang involvement. Jackie has been involved in three prison fights while serving her seven year sentence. Jackie's history of misconduct in prison is representative of many female offenders in that their misconduct violations often cross over many violations. Here we see that violations in one area are strong predictors of violations in another, in Jackie's case her gang affiliation and weapons history are correlated.

TABLE 4-8: NEGATIVE BINOMIAL REGRESSION MODEL FOR FIGHTING (N=174)

LRchi2(9) = 33.05
Prob > chi2 = 0.0010
Pseudo R2 = 0.1753

	B	SE	z-score
Race	1.07*	0.21	1.81
Age	-0.01	0.28	-0.53
Severity	-0.40	0.41	-0.98
Arrest History	-0.12	0.46	-0.26
Weapon History	0.93*	0.50	1.85
Escape History	-0.84*	0.46	-1.81
Violence History	-1.24*	0.65	-1.92
Confinement History	1.38**	0.35	3.98
Security Threat Group	1.98	2.72	0.73
Education	0.72	0.50	1.45
Work Skill	0.57	0.33	1.75
Residence	-1.39	1.08	-1.28

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

Fighting, or simple assault is a criminal violation while incarcerated. Predictors of fighting among female inmates were weapon history (b = 0.93, z = 1.85), race (b= 1.07, z = 1.81, one-tailed test), and confinement history (b = 1.38, z = 3.98). This demonstrates that female offenders who have a high risk rating for weapons possession and have spent more time behind bars were more likely to engage in fights while in prison. This is particularly true of nonwhite offenders. This is consistent with prisonization theory which argues that internalizing the beliefs and behaviors of the prison community influences recidivism. Unexpectedly, inmates with a history of violence (b = -1.24, z = -1.92) and escape history (b = -0.84, z = -1.81) were negatively associated with fighting while incarcerated.

TABLE 4-9: NEGATIVE BINOMIAL REGRESSION MODEL FOR POSSESSION OF DRUGS (N=174)

LRchi2(9) = 35.74
Prob > chi2 = 0.0004
Pseudo R2 = 0.1948

	B	SE	z-score
Race	0.65	0.30	0.22
Age	0.07*	0.31	2.40
Severity	-0.00	0.53	-0.01
Arrest History	1.00*	0.48	2.07
Weapon History	-0.91	0.67	-1.35
Escape History	0.60	0.54	0.11
Violence History	-1.25	0.82	-1.53
Confinement History	1.69**	0.41	4.16
Security Threat Group	-0.30	1.56	-0.19
Education	0.71	0.51	1.38
Work Skill	0.45	0.36	1.24
Residence	-0.53	1.02	-0.05

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

Drugs are a concern to prison staff because they can result in a barter system, which staff tries to prevent between inmates and increased criminal misconduct. Yet, drug use is prevalent in prison communities. As shown in Table 4-9, three significant predictors of drug possession emerged from the model. Arrest history (b = 1.00, z = 2.07) and age (b = 0.07, z = 2.40) were significant. This may be particularly telling because older offenders are committing more drug violations which can be associated with the "War on Drugs" campaign when the judicial system began locking up individuals for drug offenses at a growing rate. While the most significant predictor was confinement history (b = 1.69, z = 4.16). Women with more substantial criminal backgrounds who had spent more time in prison were more likely to incur an infraction for drug possession.

TABLE 4-10: NEGATIVE BINOMIAL REGRESSION MODEL FOR SEX ACTS (N=174)

LRchi2(9) = 48.08
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Pseudo R2 = 0.4518

	B	SE	z-score
Race	-0.50	0.46	-1.07
Age	0.01	0.43	0.12
Severity	-0.55	0.68	-0.82
Arrest History	-1.98	5.30	-0.38
Weapon History	0.39	5.00	0.08
Escape History	0.63	0.75	0.85
Violence History	-2.13	1.39	-1.54
Confinement History	2.54**	0.52	4.85
Security Threat Group	0.57	7.14	0.08
Education	1.34**	0.51	2.65
Work Skill	1.82**	0.62	2.92

* p< 0.05 ** p < 0.01

Engaging in sexual behavior can result in a citation in prison. As the literature shows there are numerous health risks for sexual behavior in prison. As shown in Table 4-10, there were three significant predictors of engaging in sexual acts with other inmates that emerged in the model (residency dropped from the model because 159 of the 174 cases were very low risk and STATA treated the variable as a constant). Two sociological variables were associated with sex acts. The first was education (b = 1.34, z = 2.65) and the second was work skill (b = 1.82, z = 2.92). This was particularly surprising because it was hypothesized that individuals with higher levels of work skill and education would be more apt to desist from sex acts. However, this was not the case. The higher educated the more likely these individuals were engaging in sexual misconduct. We can speculate this may be because these individuals were

more sought out. If they were entering the prison system with better hygiene, more regular doctors appointments and an overall clean bill of health they would be an appealing partner to someone in an environment that is full of STDs and HIV/AIDS. A second possibility is that these individuals are easily preyed upon in prison. If they are middle class individuals, they may not have a history of violence and may not know how to defend themselves against other inmates. They may use sex as a bargaining chip for protection.

The criminal history variable significantly related to sexual misconduct was confinement history ($b = 2.54$, $z = 4.85$). This is consistent with prisonization theory as inmates who spend more time in prison adopt more distinct roles within the community they are incarcerated within. Prior literature shows that pseudo families are likely to form in female prison communities. Therefore the connections between confinement history and sex acts are not surprising.

The central finding is that confinement history was a significant predictor in every instance of misconduct, more so than any other variable. This indicates that recurrent stints in prison have a powerful effect on behavior. Criminal history variables were stronger predictors of misconduct than demographic and social history variables. This finding supports prisonization theory which attributes an internalization of the prison subculture to an inmate's behavior while in prison.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Prisonization theory asserts that inmates who internalize the attitudes and behaviors of a criminal lifestyle are likely to develop criminal careers. Prizonization research has focused on male offenders due to the greater prevalence of male criminality, specifically among career criminals literature. In order to explore the absence of female offenders in prisonization literature this research examined official data from 174 female inmates housed in Arizona state prisons. Prisonization was examined through predictors of ten forms of institutional misconduct. Demographics, social history, criminal career, and other risk factors were also examined. In order to account for the challenges associated with count data and overdispersion, negative binomial regression models were utilized. Prior incarceration was found to have the most significant effect on inmate behavior.

This study found confinement history, arrest history, weapons history, security threat group, residence and race to positively support the hypotheses when significant. Meanwhile work skill, education, severity, age and violent history variables did not support the hypotheses when significant. These trends are best understood when examining the noncompliance acts and the criminal misconduct violations.

The five noncompliance violations included obstructing staff, refusing to listen to staff, lying to staff, threatening others and being in an unauthorized area. Confinement history was a significant predictor of all types of these acts. While confinement history is a consistent predictor of these violations, forms of misconduct are shaped by additional factors. For instance, obstruction of staff occurs when an inmate keeps a staff member from doing there job. Nonwhite inmates who had a previous history of incarceration and had few family members close were more likely to be cited for obstruction. It is possible these inmates felt

they had less to lose as they do not have family close and would not be concerned with visitation rights. Additionally, if they have previously been incarcerated they might find obstruction charges to be minor and therefore were not concerned with an infraction on their record.

Threatening others was predicated on confinement history and weapons history. Inmates who had been previously incarcerated and were a high risk for weapons possession were more likely to threaten staff. As prisonization theory suggests inmates who serve longer prison sentences are more likely adopt the prison code (Clemmer, 1940). It is plausible that this adoption may include carrying a weapon as a means of protection or intimidation. Gresham Sykes (1958) discussed one of the pains of imprisonment is a lack of security. Carrying a weapon could potentially make an inmate feel more secure and therefore more apt to challenge authority or other prisoners.

For all noncompliance violations it was hypothesized that severity or the risk rating associated with the seriousness of the crime(s) in an inmate's past would be a predictor of misconduct. It was however negatively correlated with noncompliance misconduct violations. As the literature shows inmate classifications are based on male offending patterns. It is possible that the current classification system is not accurately predicting behavior patterns in female prisoners and those females are assumed a risk for violence and misconduct when in actuality they are not a threat. This could also be related recent research findings that when females are violent, they are most often attacking a family member or partner to whom they have suffered years of abuse. For instance, if "inmate A" murdered her husband and abuser of ten years she would score high on the risk assessment rating, specifically for violence. Yet if "inmate B" had committed four counts of armed robbery, her

violence risk rating would more than likely be lower than “inmate A” but based on her repetitive counts of criminal activity, “inmate B” may actually be a bigger security risk to other inmates and prison staff than “inmate A.” Emerging research therefore advocates a gender-responsive approach to the risk assessment classification system and more research will need to be done in this area (Farr, 2000; Greenfeld & Snell, 1999; Maghan, 1999; Mann, 1996; Pollock, 2002; Salisbury et. al, 2008).

The five criminal misconduct acts examined included: aggravated assault, possession of a weapon, fighting, drug possession, and engaging in sexual behavior. Just as the noncompliance violations, confinement history was the strongest predictor of all five criminal misconduct violations. Yet, other sociological and criminal variables shed light on criminal misconduct behind bars. For instance, aggravated assault was strongly predicted by race, confinement history, and security threat group. With both incarceration and security threat group or gang affiliation being strongly associated with aggravated assault infractions it is plausible that the longer an individual has been incarcerated the more likely they are to associate with a gang. As some research shows gang affiliation is predictive of violence while in prison. This would also be consistent with Clemmer’s prisonization theory where he argued affiliation with others that have adopted the inmate lifestyle results in a higher degree of prisonization (Clemmer, 1940; Gaes et. al, 2002).

Sex acts were unusual in that two of the sociological variables, education and work skill, that were hypothesized to be negatively associated with prison misconduct were positive. In this study inmates with both higher levels of education and work skills were more likely to engage in sexual behavior while incarcerated. It is possible that these individuals were more highly sought after and may have had more opportunities for sexual behavior in

prison. The more likely explanation is that individuals with higher levels of educational obtainment and work skills, typically middle class individuals, are being taken advantage of in prison. This could be especially true for those female offenders that have no prior history of violence. Prison may not be a particularly comfortable place if they do not know how to stand up for themselves and may be preyed upon. An alternative is that these individuals seek out protection and can obtain it easily through a negotiation of sexual activities. Confinement history was also a significant predictor of sexual behavior. When applying Sykes pains of imprisonment to a female same it is possible to suggest the deprivation of heterosexual relationships frustrating for inmates and that some will turn to homosexuality while incarcerated (Sykes, 1958).

When examining the five criminal acts of misconduct education and work skill were correlated in an unexpected way to misconduct. It was hypothesized that the more education and higher work skills and individual had the less likely they would be to engage in criminal misconduct while incarcerated the reverse was true. As education and work skill were significant predictors of weapons possession and engaging in sex acts. Additionally unexpected results were found with violence and escape histories of offenders. It was hypothesized that the higher the risk rating for both a history of violence and escape the more likely an inmate would participate in criminal misconduct while incarcerated. Where the reverse was true as these were both negatively correlated with weapons possession and fighting infractions. Again, this calls into question the classification system based on male patterns of offending. Are these risk analyses inconsistent in predicting the dangerousness of female inmates? Further research will need to be conducted to examine the classification system in relation to female offenders and misconduct in prison.

In this study confinement history becomes the measure of prisonization among the female offenders. Those career criminals that are repetitively spending time behind bars are engaging in more misconduct. Here confinement history withstands all other measures as the strongest predictor of offending across both noncompliance and criminal acts of misconduct. Prisonization theory asserts that prisoners that adopt the norms of the prison culture are more likely to engage in criminal behavior while incarcerated and have higher rates of recidivism once released. When inmates adopt the prison code they often show loyalty to other inmates over prison staff. This could account for the high rates of discretionary forms of misconduct including obstructing and refusing staff. Clemmer's prisonization theory asserted that inmates would become prisonized at higher levels if they were serving a longer sentence, immersed themselves in a primary prison groups such as gangs, and were more apt to participate in deviant behaviors such as gambling and sexual practices. These characteristics coincide with the current studies findings as confinement history was a positive predictor of all ten types of misconduct. Through not only the reoccurring significance of confinement history but other individual level variables that influenced misconduct including education, work skill, residence, gang affiliation and arrest history does this provide support for prisonization theory, specifically the importation model.

The importation model argues that prisonization is the result of beliefs and behaviors outside prison that inmates bring with them while incarcerated. The importation model suggests that not all inmates equally experience the pains of imprisonment. Rather it is inmates with more extensive arrest and incarceration histories, prior involvement with gangs, serious substance abuse problems, or previous use of violence should be the most difficult-to-manage offenders behind bars. The current study found that confinement history was the

most significant predictor of prison misconduct and that reoccurring sentences served in prison may indicate more individual level problems including antisocial personalities that result in high rates of recidivism among a select group of female offenders who are also committing more misconduct while incarcerated. The fact that there are a small group of female offenders in prison who are committing the majority of the misconduct reported is significant. Prior career criminals' research has focused primarily on male offenders. This indicates that more research will need to be conducted on female offenders as career criminals (DeLisi, 2005; Irwin & Cressey, 1962; Schrag, 1954).

While important insights emerged through this study about predictors of female misconduct every study has limitations. One significant limitation to this study is the sample size. The research was conducted on a sample of 174 female offenders in Arizona. Therefore it may not be generalizable to all female offenders across the United States. This limitation may be overcome with future research through a larger sample of incarcerated female offenders of varying ages, races, sentence lengths, and criminal backgrounds in multiple geographic locations.

A second potential limitation is due to the discretionary measures of infractions by prison staff. Current research indicates that staff has a great deal of discretion in citing an inmate with an infraction; bias may exist based on an inmates ascribed characteristics. Research also indicates that misconduct is often times under reported and therefore a true picture of offenses in prison may not be indicated in the criminal records. As stated earlier, more research is needed on the effects of the male classification system on female offenders and whether or not these classifications are accurate risk assessments of female offenders, especially with their traditional history of victimization. To overcome the discrepancy of

prison staff citing inmate infractions, qualitative research may need to be conducted to compare the net effects of misconduct through the eyes of both prison staff and the inmates themselves.

A final limitation is the measure of prisonization. Prisonization in this study was measured through confinement history or history behind bars. While it can be linked to career criminal characteristics and withstood its significance to every other measure, social psychological measures may need to be added to aid in the examination of prisonization. There are measures that secondary data analysis of criminal offending records cannot obtain, such as attitudinal indicators of the extent to which an inmate subscribes to prison culture. A second step for this research is to utilize identity control theory, more specifically the meanings individuals attribute to themselves and examine how that shapes their interactions with other inmates and prison staff.

In sum, only in recent years has the discipline of criminology begun to examine the offending patterns of females in the United States. This study is just one of many that need to be conducted on samples of female offenders. Prior offending literature focuses on comparing female samples to male samples of offenders or neglects them entirely. This study shows that confinement history is a strong predictor of misconduct for incarcerated female inmates. While individual level characteristics such as age, race, education and work skill are important considerations for predicting behavior in prison, criminal history measures are stronger predictors of misconduct among female offenders. This supports the tenants of prisonization theory. More research is needed on female offenders, specifically female career criminals. A stronger understanding of female offending patterns and behavior while in

prison can serve as an impetus for designing treatment programs better equipped to meet the needs of female offenders.

APPENDIX: MISCONDUCT MEASURES

	Obstruction	Refusal	Lying	Threaten	Unauthorized Area	Aggravated Assault	Weapon Possession	Fighting	Drug Possession	Sex Acts
Race	1.59*	-0.17	-0.49	-0.44	-0.11	1.73*	-0.21	1.07*	0.65	-0.50
Age	0.01	0.23	-0.00	0.04	0.05*	0.00	0.02	-0.01	0.07*	0.01
Severity	-0.97	-0.44	-0.86*	-2.48**	-0.55	-1.71**	-2.34*	-0.40	-0.00	-0.55
Arrest History	0.58	0.56	0.40	0.05	0.72*	0.90	1.63	-0.12	1.00*	-1.98
Weapon History	0.57	0.80	0.84	2.12*	-0.02	0.68	1.57	0.93	-0.91	0.39
Escape History	-0.66	0.81*	-1.10*	0.07	-0.30	-0.74	-1.70	-0.84*	0.60	0.63
Violence History	-0.66	-3.53**	-0.19	-0.49	-0.18	-1.67	-6.90*	-1.24*	-1.25	-2.13
Confinement History	1.61**	2.10*	1.26**	1.41**	1.54**	1.44**	4.10**	1.38**	1.69**	2.54**
Security Threat Group	5.68	-1.01	6.72	2.51	-1.53	9.20*	12.57*	1.98	-0.30	0.57
Education	0.55	0.67	-0.24	0.67	1.14*	1.74	3.47**	0.72	0.71	1.34**
Work Skill	0.62	0.59	1.30**	1.22*	0.56	-0.08	-0.61	0.57	0.45	1.82**
Residence	-3.28*	0.29	-3.80**	-3.25**	-1.21	-4.34**	-3.25	-1.39	-0.53	

REFERENCES

Arizona Department of Corrections. 1996. "Inmate Disciplinary System." Arizona Department of Corrections, Phoenix AZ, Information retrieved May 10th, 2001. http://www.adc.state.az.us/Policies/DI006.htm

Blanchette, Kelley and Shelley Lynn Brown. 2006. *The Assessment and Treatment of Women Offenders, an Integrative Perspective.* West Sussex, England: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.

Bottoms, Anthony E. 1999. "Interpersonal Violence and Social Order in Prisons." *Crime and Justice,* 26, 205-281.

Britton, Dana M. 2000. "Feminism in Criminology: Engendering the Outlaw." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 571, 57-76.

Burke, Peter J. 1980. "The Self: Measurement Implications from a Symbolic Interactionist Perspective." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 43, 18-29.

Byrne, James M. and Don Hummer. 2007. "Myths and Realities of Prison Violence: A Review of the Evidence." *Victims and Offenders*, 2, 77-90.

Cao, Liqun, Jihong, Zhao, and Steve Van Dine. 1997. "Prison Disciplinary Tickets: A Test of the Deprivation and Importation Models." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25, 103-113.

Camp, Scott D., Gerald Gaes, Neal P. Langan, and Willial G. Saylor. 2003 "The Influence of Prisons on Inmate Misconduct: A Multilevel Investigation." *Justice Quarterly*, 20, 501-533.

Casey-Acevedo, Karen and Tim Bakken. 2001. "The Effect of Time on the Disciplinary Adjustment of Women in Prison." *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 45, 489-497.

Chesney-Lind, Meda. 1986. "Women and Crime: The Female Offender." *Signs*, 12, 78-96.

Chesney-Lind, Meda. 2006. "From invisible to incorrigible: The demonization of marginalized women and girls." *Crime, Media, Culture*, 2, 29-47.

Chesney- Lind, Meda and Lisa Pasko. 2004. *The Female Offender: Girls, Women and Crime*. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Clemmer, Donald. 1940. *The Prison Community*. Boston, M.A.: The Christopher Publishing House.

Craddock, Amy. 1996. "A Comparitive Study of Male and Female Prison Misconduct Careers." *Prison Journal*, 76, 60-72.

Cunningham, Mark D. and Jon R. Sorensen. 2007. "Predictive Factors for Violent Misconduct in Close Custody." *The Prison Journal*, 87, 241-253.

Daly, Kathleen and Michael Tonry. 1997. "Gender, Race, and Sentencing." *Crime and Justice*, 22, 201-252.

DeLisi, Matt. 2003. "Career Criminals Behind Bars." *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 21, 653-669.

DeLisi, Matt and Ed A. Munoz. 2003. "Future Dangerousness Revisited." *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 14, 287-305.

DeLisi, Matt, Mark T. Berg, and Andy Hochstetler. 2004. "Gang Members, Career Criminals and Prison Violence: Further Specification of the Importation Model of Inmate Behavior." *Criminal Justice Studies*, 17, 369-383.

Farr, Kathryn Ann. 2000. "Classification for Female Inmates: Moving Forward." *Crime and Delinquency*, 46, 3-17.

Fletcher, Beverly R., Lynda Dixon Shaver and Dreama G. Moon, Eds. 1993. *Women Prisoners: A Forgotten Population.* Westport, CT: Praeger/Greenwood Publishing Group.

Franklin, Travis W., Cortney A. Franklin, and Travis C. Pratt. 2006. "Examining the Empirical Relationship Between Prison Crowding and Inmate Misconduct: A meta-Analysis of Conflicting Research Results." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34, 401-412.

Gaes, Gerald G., Susan Wallace, Evan Gilman, Jody Klein-Saffran and Sharon Suppa. 2002. "The Influence of Prison Gang Affiliation on Violence and Other Prison Misconduct." *The Prison Journal*, 82, 359-385.

Garabedian, Peter G. 1963. "Social Roles and Processes of Socialization in the Prison Community." *Social Problems*, 11, 139-152.

Greenfeld, Lawerence and Tracy Snell. 2000. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report: Women Offenders, December 1999,* U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Harer, Miles D. and Neal P. Langan. 2001. "Gender Differences in Predictors of Prison Violence: Assessing the Predictive Validity of a Risk Classification System." *Crime and Delinquency*, 47, 513-536.

Henderson, Dorothy. 1998. "Drug Abuse and Incarcerated Women: A Research Review." *Journal of Substance Abuse and Treatment*, 15, 579-587.

Hochstetler, Andy and Matt DeLisi. 2005. "Importation, deprivation, and varieties of serving time: An integrated-lifestyle-exposure model of prison offending." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33, 257-266.

Hurwitz, Jon and Shannon Smithey. 1998. "Gender Differences of Crime and Punishment." *Political Research Quarterly*, 51, 89-115.

Irwin, John and Donald R. Cressey. 1962. "Thieves, Convicts and the Inmate Culture." *Social Problems*, 10, 142-155.

James, Doris J. 2004. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report: Profile of Jail Inmates, 2002*. U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office

Jiang, Shanhe and Marianne Fisher-Giorlando. 2002. "Inmate Misconduct: A Test of the Deprivation, Importation, and Situational Models." *The Prison Journal*, 82, 335-358.

Maghan, Jess. 1999. "Dangerous Inmates: Maximum Security Incarceration in the State Prison Systems of the United States." *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 4, 1-12.

Mann, Coramae Richey. 1996. *When Women Kill*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

Maxwell, Sheila and Christopher Maxwell. 2004. "Examining the "Criminal Careers" of Prostitutes Within the Nexus of Drug Use, Drug Selling, and Other Illicit Activities." *Criminology*, 38, 787-810.

Miller, Irwin and Maryles Miller. 2004. *John E Fruend's Mathematical Statistics with Applications,* 7th Ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Nagel, Ilene H. and John Hagan. 1983, "Gender and Crime: Offense Patterns and Criminal Court Sanctions." *Crime and Justice*, 4, 91-144.

Nagin, Daniel S., David P. Farrington, and Terrie E. Moffitt. 1995. "Life-Course Trajectories of Different Types of Offenders." *Criminology*, 33, 111-139.

Pollock, Jocelyn M. 2002. *Women, Prison and Crime.* 2nd Ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.

Pollock, Joycelyn M., Janet L. Mullings and Ben M. Crouch. 2006. "Violent Women: Findings From the Texas Women Inmates Study." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21, 485-502.

Poole, Eric and Robert Regoli. 1980. "Race, Institutional Rule Breaking, and Institutional Response: A study of discretionary decision making in prison." *Law and Society Review*, 14, 931-946.

Rafter, Nicole Hahn. 1983. "Prisons for Women, 1790-1980." *Crime and Justice*, 5, 129-181.

Regoli, Robert and John D. Hewitt. 2006. *Delinquency in Society.* 6th Ed. New York: McGraw Hill.

Reisig, Michael and Yoon Ho Lee. 2000. "Prisonization in the Republic of Korea." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28, 23-31.

Sabol, William, Heather Couture, and Paige M. Harrison. 2007. *Prisoners in 2006*. U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Sailsbury, Emily, Patricia Van Voorhis, and Georgia Spiropoulous. 2008. "The Predictive Validity of a Gender-Responsive Needs Assessment: An Exploratory Study." *Crime and Delinquency*, in press.

Schrag, Clarence. 1954, "Leadership among Prison Inmates." *American Sociological Review*, 19, 37-42.

Shaw, Nancy. 2003. "Cloning Scapegoats: Martha Stewart Does Insider Trading." *Social Text 77*, 21, 51-67.

Simon, Rita and Heather Ann Redding. 2005. *The Crimes Women Commit: The Punishments They Receive.* 3rd Ed. New York, NY: Lexington Books.

Steffensmeier, Darrell and Emilie Allan. 1996. "Gender and Crime: Toward a Gendered Theory of Female Offending." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, 459-487.

Stevens, Dennis. 1998. "The Impact of Time-Served and Regime on Prisoners' Anticipation of Crime: Female Prisonisation Effects." *The Howard Journal*, 37, 88-205.

Stolzenberg, Lisa and Stewart D'Alessio. 2004. "Sex differences in the likelihood of arrest." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32, 443-454.

Stretesky, Paul B., Mark Pogrebin, N. Prabha Unnithan, Gerry Venor. 2007. "Prisonization and accounts of gun carrying." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33, 1-13.

Sykes, Gresham. 1958. *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Useem, Bert. 1985. "Disorganization and the New Mexico Prison Riot of 1980." *American Sociological Review*, 50, 677-688.

Walters, Glenn D. 2003. "Changes in Criminal Thinking and Identity In Novice and Experienced Inmates: Prisonization Revisited." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 30, 399-421.

Weitzer, Ronald. 2005. "New Directions in Research on Prostitution." *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 43, 211-253.

Wheeler, Stanton. 1961. "Socialization in Correctional Communities." *American Sociological Review,* 26, 697-712.

Wolff, Nancy, Cynthia L. Blitz, Jing Shi, Jane Siegel, and Ronet Bachman. 2007. "Physical Violence Inside Prisons: Rates of Victimization." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34, 588-599.

Wright, Emily M., Emily Salisbury, and Patricia Van Voorhis. 2007. "Predicting the Prison Misconducts of Women Offenders: The Importance of Gender Responsive Needs." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice,* 23, 310-340.

Young, Vernetta D. and Rebecca Reviere. 2006. *Women Behind Bars: Gender and Race in U.S. Prisons*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Zaitzow, Barbara H. and Jim Thomas, Eds. 2003. *Women in Prison: Gender and Social Control.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Reiner.

Zedner, Lucia. 1991. "Women, Crime, and Penal Responses: A Historical Account." *Crime and Justice*, 14, 307-362.

Zorn, Christopher J.W. 1998. "An Analytic and Empirical Examination of Zero-Inflated and Hurdle Poisson Specifications." *Sociological Methods & Research,* 26, 368-400.